The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XI | New York, Saturday, May 12, 1917 | Number 132

Contents

Editorial Notes 31

Leading Editorials

Our Enemy, the Submarine 35
Economic Dictatorship in War 37
Irish Responsibility 38
Reorganizing War Administration 40

General Articles

War Taxation in Great Britain ... Oliver M. W. Sprague 42
The Logic of Tippoo Na Gai ..... Hendrik W. van Loon 44
The Presence of Death ..... Elizabeth S. Sergeant 45
The People as Poets ..... Meyer Cohn 47
Democratization of Industry ..... Donald R. Richberg 49
At the Capitol ..... C. M. 51
Correspondence 52
Books and Things ..... P. L. 56

Reviews of Books

Beethoven ..... Paul Rosenfeld 57
For the General ..... Robert H. Lowie 59
An Apology for Romance ..... H. J. L. 60

of Europe. They are heartily sick of the war, and German diplomacy will assuredly try to take every advantage of their feeling in order to tempt them into a separate peace. The Chancellor's much advertised speech has been postponed, but it will be delivered at the critical moment and it will offer terms to Russia which will be intended to detach her from the Alliance. It would be fatuous self-deception for Americans to pretend that the situation is not serious, but it would be blind stupidity to conclude that the Russian revolution will not be worth all its present inconveniences and dangers. The Russian democracy is passing through its awkward age, during which its behavior may be trying. Yet, however dangerously it exposes itself and its allies to the machinations of the German autocracy, it will prove in the end to be the most deadly enemy which that autocracy has raised in its path.

ALTHOUGH under Milukoff's guidance the provisional government of Russia has passed successfully through its first crisis, other crises will certainly follow. It is vain to expect stability in a government which depends for its authority upon the reconciliation of the radical socialism of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies with the middle class liberalism of the Duma. The situation presents striking analogies to the contest during 1792 in Paris between the Constitutional Assembly and the revolutionary clubs. If the Germans should launch a formidable attack, the two factions might sacrifice their disagreements to the pressing necessity of defending their country; but apparently the Germans do not propose to attack. A condition which approaches an armistice in practical effect, if not in diplomatic form, already exists over a large fraction of the front, and the appeal which General Gourko issued to the troops to refrain from being too friendly with the enemy, is highly significant. The revolution has afforded the people of Russia an opportunity to express their reluctance to continue the fighting, which has been denied to the other people

GERMAN diplomacy after having united the civilized world in opposition to its country is now aiming to create dissensions not only between its enemies, but within enemy nations. It is refraining from military and naval operations which will increase anti-German resentment in America and Russia, and it will probably soon propose a basis of settlement which will at least be intended to take advantage of the peace sentiment in those countries. The diplomacy of the Allies might profit by this example. A fiercer contest is taking place in Germany at the present time between liberals and reactionaries than anywhere else in the world. The government is seeking to steer a middle course between the two factions. It has no party and no real policy of its own. The liberals are apparently gaining in strength. They are imposing restraints upon the military branch of the government, and the political power of the autocracy, for which they agitated in vain during peace. Their worst handicap is the popular conviction in Germany that the Allies seek to force on their country a humiliating settlement of the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under such conditions the Allies have an opportunity also to divide their enemies and this result they can best accomplish by offering terms of peace which German liberals could support without destroying their future influence in their own country. It would be unpardonable for a group of allied governments which are fighting for the safety of democracy, to leave to the Germans the initiative both in making war and in making peace.

THE first taste of censorship is not encouraging. Secretary Lansing has muzzled every official of the State Department except himself and a month-old, unauthoritative one-man " Bureau of Foreign Intelligence." Henceforth officials who have grown up in the diplomatic service, who have held posts in Europe, Asia, South America are forbidden to talk with newspapermen. They have been denied the opportunity to guide and direct the press, to supply the necessary background and interpretation on the maze of questions raised daily by the news from all quarters of the globe, out of their own superior opportunities for knowledge, in order to interest and educate the public. From now on it will be impossible for a man anxious to clear up a complicated question on China to go to the one official in the Department who knows anything about China and secure the information. What the American people henceforth will read of their foreign relations will depend on one man, a Secretary of State who, whatever his own abilities, has shown an utter ignorance of publicity. The nation which has entered this war against autocracy, which has claimed to stand for a democratic open diplomacy, asks its citizens to make enormous sacrifices, to accept universal service in a cause which apparently cannot bear the light of publicity. Obviously, the situation gives pause. No part of the government is so secretive and so obstructive to news as is the State Department. It is a fact that the correspondents who went by invitation of the Department on the trip with the French mission telegraphed to their offices asking to be recalled because of the obstructions placed in their way. It is a fact that news of the arrival of the French mission was held up one hour and a half while an authorized official was being sought to see if it might be published. It is a fact that the Department asked the press not to print articles dealing with the policy of the government without securing the approval of the Department, and then refused to make it possible to get that approval. And more alarming still is Secretary Lansing's own admission that as yet there have not been any serious leakages of news but that he has taken this drastic step because he fears there may be. He has repudiated in practice the whole theory of frankly presenting his department's claims for public support which is supposed to underlie the recently organized publicity bureau of the federal government.

POWERS of embargo asked for by the President should be granted by Congress. It is as necessary to exercise control over export trade as over import. In a war of economic attrition, our government would be seriously crippled if it were not free to use its economic resources for military and diplomatic purposes. That the power is capable of abuse is clear. It is not less clear that the inability of the Allies to control shipments to Germany is being abused by the German government and is assisting its policy of terrorizing and driving neutral shipping off the seas. In such a situation it is wise to trust that the President will exercise the power with a minimum of danger and inconvenience to the smaller neutrals.

FOOD control is admittedly a vital necessity at the present moment, and no one will question the wisdom of conferring upon the government extensive powers over the production and distribution of food. The only serious objection to the food control bills now before Congress is that their administration is left to the Department of Agriculture, instead of to the President, with power to create appropriate executive agencies. The Department of Agriculture has its clearly defined field of operations, and its personnel and organization have been adapted to work in this field. Emergency control of the distribution and consumption of food does not naturally fall within its proper scope. To confer such control upon the Department of Agriculture would mean to divert its energies from the work it does well to work for which its competence is questionable. Congress must certainly be aware of the fact that what the American people hope and expect is that responsibility for so vital an interest as the food supply will be vested in an independently organized executive department headed by the one man whom the whole world recognizes as preëminently fitted for this work, Mr. Hoover. If the government fails to utilize Mr. Hoover's services, or employs them ineffectively in a subordinate or advisory capacity, it is certain to incur the suspicion that considerations of bureaucratic sensibilities have been given precedence over the national interest.

ONE of the weakest sections of the proposed measure of war taxation, as it is reported to the House of Representatives, will be the provision for taxing excess profits. The Committee has decided to keep the method of computing the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tax established in the present law, which takes the arbitrary figure of 8 per cent as the normal profit, and taxes all profits over 8 per cent; and it proposes merely to increase the rate of taxation of the excess, which at present is also 8 per cent, to either 12 or 16 per cent. This method of computing the tax is vicious not only because of the purely arbitrary assumption that 8 per cent is the normal profits of business, but because the computation makes no distinction between war profits and profits which are not caused by the war. There are certain industries, particularly those associated with basic minerals, like copper, iron, coal and petroleum, whose profits have become enormous during the war and will necessarily continue to be enormous. It is not advisable to reduce these profits by price-fixing because of the administrative difficulties of establishing a price which would be fair for all producers and would not need to be intermittently changed. They can best be reached by assuming all profits earned during the war, in excess of an average profit earned during a period of years preceding the war, to be dubious gains made by private individuals out of the necessities of their fellow countrymen, and by taxing these profits not at a low rate but at a very high rate. Profits of this kind can practically be confiscated without any dislocation of business, whereas the taxation of all profits over 8 per cent at a very high rate would be much more disconcerting to ordinary business.

THE adoption of the English method of computing the excess profits tax will not only yield a larger revenue without discouraging and alarming ordinary business, but it will prevent the building up of a strong vested interest in the prolongation of the war. The copper companies and the steel companies are earning so much money over the statutory 8 per cent that they could pay to the government 12 or 16 per cent of this excess without feeling it. They will still be accumulating surpluses which unless the war stops soon will enable them to accumulate almost a dollar in cash for every dollar in previous capitalization; and they will have made these accumulations not because they earned it by any new economic service but because they earned it by controlling basic raw materials which were being destroyed in huge quantities and for which, consequently, there was an artificially large demand. It is this kind of profiteering which is both demoralizing and intolerable, which if it is allowed to continue will make American participation in the war look like a capitalist conspiracy and which will create dangerous and lasting public resentment. The most effective way to disarm the popular suspicion which attributes all making of war to the machinations of those who profit from selling war supplies, is to prevent such profits from benefiting private individuals.

MR. SAUNDERS'S unauthorized boast that the submarine was beaten would not be so bad if it did nothing more than make him look foolish. Unfortunately it also makes the rest of us look foolish. The steadier newspapers of course treated the incident as it deserved, on the theory, namely, that it was important if true, but that it should not have been said even if it were true. For a few hours, however, millions of people showed how they longed for magic, how the mythology of Sunday supplement science has infected us. After almost three years of war we ought to have passed beyond hoping for miracles and have learned not to expect short cuts to victory. Science has done a great deal to make war marvelous and awful, but it is not Alladin's lamp or a fairy's wand. Invention is enormously important but it is a supplement and not a substitute for organization, and nothing would be more fatal than a widespread impression that the gigantic war of marine attrition is likely to be won suddenly by a bright idea.

INCREASE in railway rates is advanced by railway men as a cardinal point in the reforms that are to raise the efficiency of the railways to a satisfactory level. Without an increase in railway revenues, it is urged, it is impossible to make improvements out of income, or to finance them through credit issues. It is not to be denied that all materials and services required by the railways have in recent years advanced in price more rapidly than railway gross earnings, and that in consequence many railways, although performing a greater service than ever before, are receiving smaller net incomes. If railway net earnings were not exorbitant three years ago, they would appear to be too low now. Some increase in rates may be justified. Whether the present is an auspicious time to press for the fifteen per cent advance in rates long demanded by the railways is, however, open to question. The representatives of the railways will wisely avoid all popular suspicion that they are employing their great influence in the present crisis to win for the railways what might not have been granted had we remained out of the war. If their coöperation with the government is to be effective, its disinterestedness must not be subject to suspicion. Any proposals for advancing railway charges should be of such a character as to make it certain that the increased earnings will be used, not to redress old grievances of railway investors, but to improve the mechanism of transportation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE General Railroad Board of the Council of National Defense is urging upon the railways of the country the introduction of sweeping operating reforms and economies during the war. More service can be got out of the existing railway equipment by longer runs for locomotives, prompter handling at terminals, better coöperation between roads, and reduction in the average time given to repair of rolling stock. It is indicated that by reducing the number of locomotives under repair from fifteen per cent to ten per cent an equivalent of 3,325 locomotives can be added to the service, and another equivalent of 13,300 locomotives can be added by lengthening the average run from 75 miles to 90 miles. Quicker movement of cars and heavier loading could be made to release some 715,000 cars. It is worth noting that analogous improvements in efficiency, suggested by Brandeis some years ago as an alternative to increase of rates, were pronounced impracticable by railway men. The situation has materially changed in that the railways are to be operated for the war under something like a unified organization. Hence competitive considerations need not be taken into account. It will be none the less interesting to determine what technical and financial results may be obtained through such application of scientific management as war conditions make possible.

TWENTY-THREE trade union women have been appointed on the sub-committee on women in industry, advisory to the Council of National Defense. The Committee does not intend to limit its scope merely to conditions of employment under government contracts. Already leading railroads and great corporations are planning to engage women to replace men. The Committee will insist that equal pay shall be given for equal work, and fair remuneration in all cases. It also recommends that women who wish to do patriotic industrial work should be warned of the danger of undercutting existing wage standards and displacing workers dependent on their own earnings. Still another danger is the increasing employment of married women with young children. Certainly these women should be the last class called upon in the mobilization of industry, and by bringing this and other vital facts of labor conditions before the public the Committee is doing real service.

SENATOR Elon R. Brown, Republican majority leader in the upper house at Albany, is trying to abrogate the New York State labor laws during the war crisis. His bill would give the industrial commission power to revise the safeguards limiting hours and night work for women and children, and making compulsory one day of rest in seven. The experience of England being quoted against him, Mr. Brown said, "As for England, I doubt whether any man in the Capitol reads as much English literature as I do." Fortunately, however, we need not accept Mr. Brown's knowledge of "English literature" as the final authority. Bulletin 221 of the United States Department of Labor, just issued, reprints memoranda of the English Health of Munition Workers' Committee, which show that after eighteen months of war, the highest efficiency could be maintained only under conditions approximate to those now imposed by the New York laws. In some respects the English laws adopted during the war are even more considerate of the workers than our peace laws. Senator Brown's attempt, if it be based on patriotic motives, will defeat its own end.

ANOTHER striking feature of the Brown bill is that it would serve to remove protection only from the weaker and unorganized employees—largely women and children. The hours and conditions of labor in most trades depend, as in England, not on laws, but on agreements between unions and employers. When England at the beginning of the war wanted to alter these schedules, she called representatives of the trades unions into conference and adjusted the matter with them. The experience of the war has shown that most of the limitations in times of peace were substantially grounded in physiological law, and the present tendency is to return to them as essential safeguards not only of health but of maximum production. But the main point is that if any readjustment were found desirable, it could be put into effect in any general way not through such a measure as the Brown bill, but through a revision of existing agreements. The Brown bill aims to remove the protection of law where it is needed most and where the removal could least be resisted by the employees affected. If passed it will give the workers a powerful demonstration of the necessity of organization.

CALIFORNIA'S land settlement bill recently passed both houses of the legislature by overwhelming majorities. Preparations are making under the act to purchase a 5,000 acre tract of land to be developed as an organic unit. The department of farm engineering of the state agricultural college is woking out systematic plans. Soon we shall have in this country one little oasis in which the farmer may set out upon his career without the handicap of insanitary and ill designed buildings, a grinding mortgage or the desperate isolation of the frontier. If the project is success-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful—and all the technical conditions point to its success—the movement thus inaugurated is certain to extend itself. But unless taxation is employed to check the development of unearned increment, most of the benefits from recolonization will fall to the existing land owners.

Our Enemy, the Submarine

FROM the facts about the increasing success of the German submarine campaign which have been permitted to leak out during the past ten days, one conclusion of some importance to Americans becomes imposing. If the United States had shrunk from accepting the challenge of Germany, and had refused to place all her resources as a belligerent at the disposal of the Allies, France and Great Britain would in the end have probably been obliged to accept at the dictation of Germany a disadvantageous peace. The attrition of British mercantile tonnage is apparently proceeding at a faster rate than that of the German army. Neither the multiplication of submarine chasers nor the arming of merchant vessels nor any of the rumored devices for the detection of submarines or the frustration of their assaults has succeeded in checking the ominous increase in shipping casualties. If we admit the probability in the future of an improvement in the methods of defense, we must also admit a no less persuasive probability of a constantly increasing production of still more efficient submarines. The result, in the absence of American assistance, would have been a destruction of mercantile shipping at the rate of probably 500,000 tons a month faster than it could be replaced. A loss even as heavy as this would not have involved the starvation of Great Britain, but it would have made it impossible for that country to perform essential economic services for her allies, and it might probably have forced very soon the abandonment of military operations in the Mediterranean area, conducted over long lines of maritime communication. Even if Germany would not have had a free hand in dictating peace, she could hardly have been prevented from getting the better of the Allies in the bargain.

The coming of the United States to the assistance of the Allies has not as yet foreclosed the possibility of German victory. If the German submarine attack waxes still more effective during the long summer days, the destruction of British and neutral tonnage may proceed at a rate so rapid that the offensive power of the Allied armies will be seriously diminished; and this fact, taken in connection with the precarious standing of the Russian government, may enable the Germans to bargain successfully for a peace advantageous for them. But if the destruction of mercantile tonnage during the summer is not inordinately great, and if, consequently, time can be secured to throw the complete industrial resources of the United States into the balance, American intervention will make to the Allies the whole difference between an advantageous and a disadvantageous position in negotiating for peace. For unless the submarine assault reaches an unprecedented and improbable momentum it will be possible by sufficiently organizing and increasing the ship-building ability of the country for the enemies of Germany to put vessels into the water faster than the Germans can sink them. Hitherto we have been calculating on the necessity of adding to the existing production of steel vessels at approximately a rate of 100,000 tons a month, a further production of wooden vessels at the rate of 200,000 tons a month. But by the adoption of very drastic measures, by abandoning the construction of battleships and cruisers, and steel frame buildings, and by securing for the shipping a prior claim in the needed materials and labor, this output could probably be doubled before next spring. Once such a rate of production was attained, the German submarine attack, formidable and sinister as it is, would almost certainly be checked, and the chance of a German victory be proportionately diminished.

The news of the past ten days, however, disquieting as it is, can be made to serve a useful purpose. It should not only stimulate the government to undertake an even more complete concentration of the industrial energy and technical skill of the country upon the task of keeping the seas open, but it should help to stimulate the interest of the American public in the nature and importance of the specific objects to accomplish which the American nation has entered the war. The President's address to Congress initiating hostilities with Germany, able and persuasive as it was, may be criticized for one defect of emphasis. He failed to fasten American public attention upon the peculiar importance for America of the concrete situation and problem raised by the submarine campaign. He did not sufficiently insist upon the ultimate menace which the submarine attack on commerce carried to the security of the American democracy and its decisive effect both in justifying American participation in the war and in moulding American objects and policy with respect to peace. The submarine forced us in not merely because it gave additional urgency to the general threat of German victory, but because of the special danger to the United States of a German victory extorted chiefly as a consequence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of successful terrorism on the high seas. The submarine campaign, that is, was not, as might be inferred from the President's speech, merely a convenient pretext for interpolating the most powerful democracy of the new world into a fight between democracy and autocracy in the old world. It was the one particular offense which was sufficient to associate the interests of democracy in the new world with those of European democracy. It was every bit as clearly a crossing of the frontier, upon the inviolacy of which the United States depends for its security, as if the Germans had landed an army in Mexico. Should Germany be victorious, chiefly as a consequence of the submarine attack on commerce, should the world as it emerges from the war not be organized to prohibit or discourage the kind of destruction and the kind of terrorism which is now being wrought on the high seas, then the American democracy will be vanquished and its survival endangered no matter what flag is saluted in Metz, Warsaw, Constantinople, or Bagdad, and no matter what fate befalls the Romanoffs and the Hohenzollerns.

The new facts which have been developed since the German government unleashed the submarine enable us better to understand both the full extent of the submarine menace and how only, or probably, it can be overcome. That weapon is justifying almost to the limit the fears of its enemies and the hopes of its friends. It is proving to be one of the most consummate instruments of destruction ever invented by the ingenuity of man. It may constitute the most decisive single factor in the present war; and unless its power of destruction is regulated in some way, it will certainly count as a wholly decisive factor in any future wars among industrial nations. As a consequence of its invention and improvement, a nation weaker than its enemy in capital ships, which, consequently, is unable to control the surface of the seas, can nevertheless by means of the submarine deprive sea power of what has been in the past its greatest advantage—that of being assured against the interruption of its maritime communications. Thus sea power, in the sense of the unimpeded occupation of the ocean's surface, has been dealt a body blow. The government which possesses naval preponderance can still annihilate the commerce of its enemy, but it can no longer protect its own shipping, and if its raw material and food supply depend on commerce it can no longer count surely on its own safety. Neither is it apparent how this danger can be averted merely by improved naval armament. If the experience of the present war has any permanent value, submarine destroyers and armed merchant vessels can only mitigate without overcoming the danger. These defensive weapons provide at best a means of increasing the mortality of submarines and consequently, of necessitating a huge expenditure in order to maintain a sufficient supply. The submarine attack will be defeated, at least during the present war, not by making it impossible for the submarine to live, but by building merchant shipping faster than it is being sunk. Like all other phases of modern war the submarine attack on commerce brings with it an exhausting competition in attrition. If a better defense cannot be devised against it, sea power will be deprived of its ability to police the ocean highways, and the sea will become the arena for a suicidal duel between militarism, armed with the submarine, and British navalism.

The march of civilization itself may depend on the ability of the Christian nations to find an escape from the consequences of such a contest. Englishmen seem to look for it in an overwhelming defeat of Germany, which could be used to extort from her government an agreement under penalties to abandon in the future submarine terrorism. But even if Germany can be overwhelmingly defeated, which is doubtful, the possible commerce destroying ability of the submarine cannot merely be legislated out of existence. It has proved to be such a consummate weapon that sooner or later either Germany or some other great military power will use it to contest with naval power the control of the seas. Under the same circumstances Germany would use it again as she is using it now, and so would any nation, including the United States, which was being blockaded by a superior fleet and was in danger of being crushed as a result of the blockade.

The real escape from the terrifying consequences of such a duel is to be found in an attempt not to disarm or disqualify the adversary, but to leave him without any real grievance. If he is asked to abandon submarine terrorism he must be secured against the consequences of having sea power used for the benefit of discriminating nationalistic purposes. The ocean must cease to be merely neutral territory and be converted into a genuinely international domain, governed by international authority, and administered for the joint benefit of all the nations. On the highways of this estate all trade must be conducted by vessels which are either owned or controlled by an international trust; and every nation must be guaranteed against the interruption of this service, except as a punitive consequence of a rebellion against the international authority. Under such a system the submarine would be deprived of its terrors because its use as a commerce destroyer would be much more costly to the offending nation than its abandonment. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would involve as a penalty commercial and political isolation—a combination against her of the seafaring nations; and she would never risk the disaster of such an adverse combination provided she was guaranteed the freedom of the seas on anything like fair and equal terms. This is the only adequate solution. Before the present war is over seafaring commercial nations must be persuaded to follow the example of the United States and resist the submarine terrorism, but they will scarcely join the two countries in an attempt to outlaw the submarine as commerce-destroyer unless they, like Germany, are assured of a police control over naval sea power and maritime commerce which cannot be suspected of being established for exclusively national purposes.

Economic Dictatorship in War

DICTATORSHIP, economic as well as military, is a condition every European state at war has been forced to accept. America, too, is being forced to accept it. With us, however, economic dictatorship is more imminent than military dictatorship. Men are required of us by our allies, but what is most required is munitions and food. If we cannot supply these, our cause is lost, no matter what resources of valor American manhood may boast. And this fact imposes upon us a double responsibility for effective action in the economic field.

In former wars it was possible to depend upon private enterprise to respond spontaneously to the national need under the stimulus of high prices. When the army needed the food that civilians were wasting the government entered the markets and got the food required, and incidentally raised the price so that civilians were less disposed to waste. When the navy needed auxiliary shipping, its bid for charters abstracted the required tonnage from private trade, creating a confusion in transportation, no doubt, but nothing worse. The present war differs from all others in its insatiate demands. It has brought us to a pass in which there will not be enough food or shipping or munitions in the world, unless production and consumption are subjected to a control far more energetic than can be operated through mere changes in the price structure. Men who could afford to hold their plants idle must none the less be compelled to keep them in operation. Men who could afford to waste must be compelled to save. Moreover, what kind of goods a factory is to turn out, what kind of commodities the consumer is to have, must be subject to control. A mill may be specially equipped for the rolling of structural shapes, and there may be a profitable demand for such shapes, still the government may order the diversion of the mill to the production of ship plates. The consumer may prefer fine white bread, but if the government orders, all flour will be gray, or perhaps mixed with cornmeal. If the government orders, the "all wool" garments will become more nearly all cotton than they were in the heyday of private adulteration. If it orders, everybody will wear composition shoes, whatever the individual preference for leather may be.

There are some optimists who see in the economic dictatorship of the present war a prelude to the future socialistic state. But it is socialistic only in the limited sense that selective conscription is democratic. Either institution, in its existing form, is adapted to the present desperate emergency. Either is capable of developing remarkable energies under the stress of a great war. And either would be likely to degenerate into a hideous instrument of tyranny if continued unchanged after the war. Who, in time of peace, would care to leave it to a government to decide whether his chosen work were of such minor value as to make him a fit subject for conscription for public service? Who would care to have the government determining what he should produce, what he should eat and wear? These institutions, designed for war, must be so organized that they will serve efficiently their purpose, and disappear upon the return of peace. Otherwise personal liberty is at an end.

Efficiency in our economic dictatorship is the quality immediately required. Whether we shall get it or not depends in the first instance upon the kind of men we select for the supreme responsibility of organizing and administering the services of control. We shall not find them in the permanent public service, civil or military, except by extraordinary accident. Public service at its best produces men who value above all things a flawless record. They are men who will spare neither labor nor time to avoid mistakes. They will do nothing without distinct authority and warrant of law. They are men who refuse to let contracts for construction of pressing necessity because appropriations have not been formally voted, although there is not the least doubt that the appropriations will be voted before the contracts are filled. They are men who in a great food crisis stand idly by while thousands of acres go fallow for want of the seed wheat that is being transformed into flour a few hundred miles away. Nobody in our governmental service is authorized to buy seed in Minneapolis for distribution in the Dakotas and Montana. Therefore it can't be done. If we are to organize our munitions, food and shipping service for war, they must be in charge of men accustomed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to act without authority when they are convinced that the public need requires action. We must have men who do the things that can't be done. Sometimes they make mistakes and accept the consequences, popular execration and dismissal from the service.

There is only one field in which we can find men who will meet requirements such as these. This is the field of private business of a developmental character. We must draft into the public service men who have organized railways, mines, and industrial enterprises, and use them, not in an advisory capacity, but as responsible executives. And these in turn must be free to select subordinates who like themselves are accustomed to assume responsibility. There is no other way in which we can assure ourselves of the prompt action a war emergency requires.

Moreover, there is no other way in which we can secure the full functioning of the private services it is sought to control. Only men who have been trained in the management of large businesses can meet other business men on the same plane, and enlist their enthusiasm and creative abilities. The permanent public official can at best secure a perfunctory coöperation from business men. He can induce the steel manufacturer to deliver his usual output with the customary delay. What we need is someone who can make the steel manufacturer bend all his energies to the production of an unprecedented output in record time. The permanent public official may make the miller adapt his processes as well as might reasonably be expected to the condition of a short wheat supply. What we need is someone who will set the miller himself at work upon the best possible solution of the problem. The virtue of private industry consists in elasticity. It can produce greater results than might reasonably be expected of it. This elasticity is not to be won from industry by the methods of permanent officialdom. Only men who have themselves solved problems of business organization and who know the possibilities of effective performance can force a private enterprise to yield its maximum service to the government.

A war service organized by business men, according to the principles of active private business, may easily be discontinued upon the return of peace. No business man powerful enough to head the munitions, food, shipping or transportation services of the government, would expect to be paid at the rate prevailing in private industry. He would serve the government at a loss to himself. The same thing would be true of such subordinates as he might select. To give up office at the close of the war would fall in with the natural desires of men of this character. A war service with personnel selected from the permanent officials of the government would inevitably seek to perpetuate itself. The discontinuance of such a service, which would mean liberation to a business man conscripted for the purpose, would mean to the civil servant serious loss in dignity, if not in income.

The war has thrust upon us the necessity of extending the power of government over our economic life. When peace returns such extensions of power ought to lapse, and the services created for their execution ought to be disbanded. Otherwise we shall be left with a legacy of bureaucratic interference with our liberties quite revolting to our democratic traditions. It follows that we ought to oppose every effort, no matter how patriotic in intention, of the existing branches of the public service to extend their control over the new field. Munitions, food, transportation, and shipping ought to be controlled by executive departments created ad hoc, responsible only to the President. Such departments would doubtless draw heavily upon the permanent public service for assistance. For the rest, the permanent public service will be sufficiently occupied in carrying on through the war the kind of work to which it was devoted in time of peace.

Irish Responsibility

THE visiting British commission has very naturally declined to encounter the issue of Irish home rule. No international commission or commissioner in this inflammable world can be too certain what issues are irrelevant, but it is an obvious necessity in the present case to limit attention to the overwhelming obligations of the war. The priority of these obligations does not, however, dispose of the settlement of Ireland or even of the American interest in the matter. In spite of the suggestion that it is " pro-German " to admit that Ireland is an unsettled small nationality, the home rule problem remains in all its toughness and tenderness, and with contingencies of importance to the United States.

Any interest of the United States in Irish home rule is reckoned as intrusive by some Americans, and they urge that the matter is too internal and domestic to be suitably discussed. Englishmen like Lloyd George and Northcliffe do not share this delicacy. They realize that in the nature of the case the United States is too closely identified with Great Britain as well as with Ireland, too sharply conscious of the merciless contiguity of modern states, not to have a deep moral concern in a settlement so obviously needed. After the fashion of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all transplanted patriotisms, the Irish question has tended to be a politicians' vested interest in the United States, and on that account has seriously suffered as a patent moral issue, but it is still the fact, however unpalatable it may be to admit it, that the claims of the Irish under imperial rule are formally the same as the claims of any other subordinated nationality, and Ireland invokes the interest of the United States in the same sense though not necessarily to the same effect as Belgium, Serbia or Poland. The problem of political organization offered by these latter "small nationalities" is different in degree from the problem offered by Ireland, but this does not affect the evident issue that Irish home rule is inextricable from the cause of democracy and liberty which the English-speaking peoples have espoused.

To say this is to say very little. It is merely to repeat what British liberals have been iterating for forty years. If home rule were incompatible with British sovereignty no one could advocate it without having an unfriendly willingness to derange the British Empire. The naked truth, however, is that home rule has not only been an Irish but also an English demand for over a generation and is no more incompatible with British sovereignty than the once bitterly contested claims to self-government of Canada or South Africa or Australia. It is the stubborn establishments which home rule disregards rather than any modified freedom it confers that in great measure accounts for the temper of Tory, Orange and bureaucratic opposition.

Although this is a war for democracy it has proved significantly difficult to mobilize war sentiment in Ireland and it has been plainly inexpedient to include the Irish in the scheme of conscription. This is so powerful a commentary on the consequences of Tory policy that it should arrest even the dullest of junkers. If Britain were not democratic the junkers in Britain would have paid no more attention to Irish scruples than any junkers elsewhere. There would have been Irish conscription, as the Orangemen and the old-fashioned military men demanded, or Ireland would have known a scourge. As it is, the refusal of conscription emphasizes a discrepancy between English and Irish sentiment that has its roots in legislative dissatisfaction. Despite the most sustained pressure, Ireland has dissociated itself from a war in which it naturally and tempermentally belongs, and until its nationalism is permitted exercise it can only be conscripted by violence.

The exercise of Irish nationalism under home rule is not so sentimental as it sounds. It means more than anything else opening the door of opportunity to the common people of Ireland and allowing the machinery of government to yield rather more readily to the disposition of all the people who are governed. A great deal is said of the injustice that is to be feared by the Protestant minority in Ireland from an accession of popular control. More anxiety about the injustice and privilege that are now a matter of course in Ireland would put the situation of the Unionist minority in rather a better moral light. Popular control is so carefully restricted by the home rule bill that the only interest clearly violated is a minority's time-honored consciousness of being preferred. The home rule parliament is trusted with simple local autonomy and it is not even permitted to control or reduce the state constabulary of 12,000 men, for example, for its first six years. There is no minority apprehension that the home rule bill does not seem to recognize, even to the verge of caricaturing its own name. Yet, to speak very broadly, there is ample evidence of minority terror at the idea of the native majority being now allowed more intimate exercise of plainly constitutional power.

The political craftsmen in England are at present somewhat disposed to wash their hands of Ireland and to assert that but for Irish differences the problem could readily be solved. Ireland would do well to act as if this conclusion were as magnanimous as it seems. Were Ireland a mid-Atlantic island no one pretends that the junkers could have their way, but also no one believes that there would be invincible difficulty of agreement between industrial Ulster and the agricultural south. The agricultural preponderance in numbers and wealth and necessity for development would certainly excite a competitive uneasiness in the industrial section, but the all-round prospects of a sound national government would eventually sway any commonwealth. It is largely the knowledge of a neighboring English parliament educated to the special needs of industry that makes the industrial corner of Ulster insist on remaining in the union. The considerations, as this Ulster sees them, are commercial and practical, and home rule in Dublin offers a poor exchange. Such a feeling is unfortunately reinforced by a consciousness of racial and religious differences, stimulated by every religious and aristocratic junker in Great Britain, one that cannot brook the idea of good Protestant imperialists sharing government with ignorant Papists. This is a sincere persuasion, but as Ulster has already survived such intolerable atrocities as Catholic emancipation, church disestablishment, the denaturing of the coronation oath and elective county councils, it may be supposed that home rule will not accelerate Presbyterian mortality so long as Ulster property rights and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Belfast credit are not also seriously jeopardized.

Since home rule must have goodwill back of it to succeed, however, there is every reason why Irishmen should take the English at their word in this juncture, and decide for themselves the ponderability of all the criticism and prejudice which persist in spite of a nominated upper house, limited powers of legislation, an executive controlled from England and an imperial supreme authority. Nationalist Ireland can no more give up the principle of home rule to Ulster on the one hand than to the separatist rebel on the other. But under that principle there should be considerable flexibility. What would Ulster want from the rest of Ireland if Ireland were towed away from Great Britain and anchored in the center of a salubrious ocean? What would the Sinn Fein party want? What would the Irish Agricultural Organization Society want? Under home rule these questions will need to be answered, and Ireland can prove its willingness to govern itself by eliciting the answers now.

There may be excellent reasons why a genuinely representative convention cannot be held in Ireland, where the Ulster minority could be required to voice its interests and its claims in relation to the rest of Ireland, and where the rest of Ireland could directly express itself in regard to those claims and interests. Such a convention, if practicable, undertaking for Ireland what the Quebec Convention undertook for Canada, what the federal convention undertook for the United States, might bring out of Ireland just such an understanding as England has so vainly tried to dab on from outside. The home rule principle is not to be abandoned, but inside that principle there must clearly be an opportunity for industrial Ulster to function and for all Ulster to feel its responsibility to the rest of Ireland. What are the terms, granted home rule, that Ulstermen require from their fellow-Irishmen, and that will appeal to the conscience of the world?

The day is over when the Ulster junker can be a dog in the manger. A great democratic experiment is being suspended because of nebulous claims and muttered dissatisfactions. If the world is to sympathize with Ulster, Ulster must present a clear account of the material and immaterial interests that are possibly to be jeopardized by home rule. To do so, Ulster should be given a forum in Ireland by Irishmen, and there should be a concerted attempt to bring a material program to the world. If such a program is dislocated by any obstinacy on either side, the conscience of all allied nations after the war will support the side that has made good its democratic assertions.

Until Irishmen among themselves clarify the problem of Ulster's place under home rule, no positive conviction in favor of military support for unconditional home rule can be reckoned on. The question has reached the stage where extra-parliamentary action needs to be taken by representatives of all the interests involved. Those interests that refuse without warrant to convene under such circumstances lose their claim on democratic conscience in the world at large—and democratic conscience may be counted on to be effective in the long run if the realities of the case are now embraced by an exclusively Irish statesmanship.

Reorganizing War Administration

IN Washington these days there is a swirl of activities and plans working through a maze of volunteer committees, and pounding, sometimes with effect and sometimes without effect, upon a rather stationary bureaucracy. Spontaneity and goodwill and hard work, even brilliancy, are there in quantities, dragged down by routineers, by a normal amount of jealousy, by a considerable amount of hackneyed conservatism, and often by the wrong kind of competition in the wrong places. The vested interests of departments and bureaus obtrude, and information as to how the nations have been organized in Europe is rather scarce. Now if things go slowly or badly, superficial criticism will begin to shriek about some individual and will demand a scapegoat. But the truth of the situation is that the administrative system of the war is not yet arranged for emergency action.

Responsibility is not definitely located. The Council of National Defense consists of six Cabinet officials. The Advisory Commission consists of a group of men whose function is advisory with a tendency to become executive. This advisory commission is the prolific parent of a gigantic system of committees, also advisory but tending to become executive. Theoretically the actual administration of the war is still on a peace basis modified by advice from the outside. The more or less expert volunteers are delegated certain powers, a bit here and a bit there, but their function and their relations to the departments are hazy and overlapping. The difficulty is increased by the haphazard way in which the old departments have grown by accretion so that their jurisdictions are infinitely confused. The War Department for example has to dredge rivers and construct public works. Agencies which affect shipping are scattered through several departments, and interdepartmental coöperation is notoriously diffi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cult. The authorities are multiform and elusive.

It might as well be recognized now as later that modern war cannot be waged through the peace establishment assisted and advised by outsiders. It is a fundamental confusion which means delay, hesitation and the timidity which grows where responsibility is concealed. It means that public attention is dissipated, becomes hysterical, and in the end so capricious that it will turn savagely on some individual whose only fault may be that he is overworked, not coördinated to a general plan, and involved in a faulty system. If results are to be achieved without infinite waste and trouble a drastic simplification is needed.

It would involve the divesting of the War and Navy Departments of all their irrelevant burdens, of all the dredging of rivers, governing of the Philippines, letting of contracts, so that they can concentrate on the single business of operating the army and navy. Rivers and harbors, public works of a peace character should be turned over to the Department of the Interior where they logically belong. Every question of securing supplies should then be centralized in a specially created Munitions Department. An advisory committee plus the old bureaus will not do. A Munitions Department must be executive and it requires full war powers over the industry of the nation. It should be a new department created for the emergency under the direct authority of the President. Whether the head of it should sit in the Cabinet is a minor matter provided his powers are sufficient. The Munitions Department would then absorb and coördinate many of the committees now advising the Advisory Commission. But it would differ from them in that it had power to execute its plans.

The second new department needed for the emergency is Food Control. Drastic emergency regulation is not workable through a Department of Agriculture, which will need all its energies to stimulate production. Food control deals with the distribution and consumption of food, matters which should be sharply distinguished from, though coördinate with, production. If the Department of Agriculture tries to perform both functions it will almost certainly destroy its usefulness. To stimulate production means to work with the farmer and keep on very good terms with him. But Food Control is politically a most dangerous business, cutting into all kinds of special interests. It is moreover an enormously complex business which has to be carried on in a hurry. It is established for an emergency and it will fail if red tape and leisurely departmental habits prevail. The man to create Food Control is at hand, and he should be given full powers. No attempt should be made to divert a superlative administrator like Herbert Hoover to the helpless position of a mere adviser.

Besides munitions and food there is the supreme matter of shipping. There is need here of more drastic powers and more complete centralization of all shipping matters in the hands of a few responsible men. The tonnage problem is so urgent, it has such immense diplomatic possibilities, that in order to act effectively the government ought to take possession of and operate as a unit all shipyards and all tonnage now under the American flag, or building in shipyards either for American or foreign owners.

Briefly then, the conduct of the war requires three new and powerful executive departments—munitions, food control and shipping. This at least is what the dearly bought experience of Europe indicates, and the conclusion is justified by underlying principles of administrative science. Even with the simplification of machinery the war government will be extraordinarily complex. But it is certain that serious trouble is due in the economic strategy of the war if we attempt to work with the confusing system of the departments assisted, advised and diverted by advisers whose functions are elusive.

These centralized controls over the vital factors of the war are needed for internal efficiency. But they are needed also for real coöperation with our Allies. Since this is so dominantly a war of resources, it is clear that success depends upon economical and precise use of supplies. This points to the necessity of an Economic General Staff of the Allies, consisting of the shipping, food, munitions and financial controllers of each of the belligerents. Then the larger plans of international coöperation would be decided in consultation, of course, with the Foreign Office.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN JOHNSON
GEORGE SOULE—Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War Taxation in Great Britain

DURING the twelve months ending March 31st the revenue of the British government from taxation was nearly $2,600,000,000, almost $1,800,000,000 more than for the last year preceding the war. This additional taxation has not affected the business of the country unfavorably. It has not proved a damper on business enterprise and it has not weakened motives for thrift; not only so, but the taxes have proved positively advantageous. While the standard of life of no class in the community has been seriously lowered, individual consumption of comforts and luxuries has been materially reduced, thus setting free labor and capital for war purposes. Another, and even more important, advantage has also been secured through the imposition of additional taxation. The evident justice of taxing heavily those whose incomes have risen since the beginning of the war has stimulated the people generally to wholehearted exertion in every field of economic activity.

In all respects save one, the British example affords conclusive ground for the immediate imposition in the United States of taxes as heavy as those now levied in Great Britain. The present scale of these taxes was not adopted at the beginning of the war. Additional taxation was imposed in November, 1914, again in September, 1915, and finally in April, 1916. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the opinion gaining some currency that we also should adopt a similar course. But here English experience does not yield a valid precedent. It is now generally agreed in Great Britain that the present scale of taxes could with advantage have been imposed at an earlier date, and the reasons for the adoption of the policy of gradual increase of taxation are entirely without force for this country. The cost of modern warfare as well as the duration of the present war were underestimated. The outbreak of war, moreover, occasioned serious dislocation in the trade of the country and a temporary breakdown of the foreign exchanges throughout the world. A moratorium became necessary. Mobilization of a peaceful community for war involved the transfer of a large proportion of the capital and labor of the country from accustomed employments to new uses. None of these conditions is found in the United States at the present time. The entrance of this country into the war does not require anything in the nature of a revolutionary change in our economic activities. Trade with the countries with which we are now at war has long since been at a standstill—the war itself will simply intensify certain influences which have been potent factors in the situation during the last two years. In these circumstances there is not the slightest ground for holding that we cannot assume at once and without difficulty the burden of taxation which our British allies have gradually imposed upon themselves and which is to be increased in the budget of the current year.

The backbone of the British structure of taxation is the income tax. The provisions of the law are highly complicated and only the most salient features can be indicated in a short article. Only those with incomes under £130 a year are exempt. Those with incomes between £130 and £400 are allowed an abatement of £120, those with incomes between £400 and £600 an abatement of £100 and between £600 and £700 an abatement of £70. All persons with incomes under £700 are also allowed an abatement of £25 for each child. Those whose income exceeds £700 are taxed on the entire amount.

The lowest rate of the tax is now 2s, 3d in the pound, or 11¼ per cent on earned incomes under £500. On unearned incomes of £500, that is, incomes derived from investments, the rate is 3s in the pound. A man with an earned income of £500, thanks to the abatement of £120 and allowing for an abatement of £75 for three children, would then pay a tax of 2s, 3d on £325, which is equivalent to $183 or 7¼ per cent on his entire income of $2,500. From this rate of 2s, 3d on incomes under £500 the rates advance by a succession of steps until 5s in the pound or a 25 per cent tax is levied upon the entire amount of unearned incomes of £2,000, and on all earned incomes of £2,500, 5s in the pound is the standard rate. It is interesting to note that incomes of $4,000 which are entirely exempt in this country are subject to a 12½ per cent tax if earned and to a tax of 17½ per cent if derived from investments.

All income in excess of £2,500 is further subject to supertaxes which also advance in a succession of steps from 10d on the first £500 of excess to 3s, 6d on all income over £10,000. A man, then, with an income of $250,000 would pay a tax of 25 per cent on $12,500, higher rates on successive parts of his income up to $50,000, and 42½ per cent on all income in excess of that amount. Income tax rates were materially increased in April, 1914, but the present income tax rates in Great Britain impose a burden which ranges from two and one-half to three and one-half times that which rested upon taxpayers before the war. For the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year ending March 31st, 1914, income tax revenue was only £47,250,000; for the year ending March 31, 1916, the huge sum of £205,033,000 was secured from this source. When account is taken of the British income tax it becomes positively ludicrous for anyone to style as confiscatory the proposal now under consideration to impose a forty or even fifty per cent tax on the excess of income over $1,000,000.

In virtually all the belligerent countries, excess profit taxes have been imposed since the beginning of the war. The principle of these taxes is quite unlike the tax on profits above a definite return on capital to which the same name has been given in this country. The English excess profits tax is designed to secure for the state a part of those profits which, generally speaking, are definitely due to the war. In November, 1915, a tax of 50 per cent (raised to 60 per cent in April, 1916) was imposed on all profits in excess of the average profits of each business during two of the last three years preceding the war, the taxpayer being permitted to select the two years which are to serve as a base. This tax has proved unexpectedly remunerative, yielding a revenue of nearly £140,000,000 during the last twelve months. It has not crippled industry. The business community generally has recognized that it is a proper war revenue measure. For the current year rate of the tax has been advanced from 60 to 80 per cent.

In addition to the income and excess profits taxes, there has been a considerable increase in indirect taxation. Following the wise British tradition, heavy taxes have been imposed on a few articles rather than a multitude of duties and excises on many commodities and services. The duty on tea has been increased from 10 cents to 25 cents a pound; on coffee and cocoa a duty of 10 cents a pound is levied; and on sugar a duty of 3½ cents a pound. These, together with a very considerable increase in the duties on gasoline, tobacco and alcoholic beverages, are the principal sources from which additional revenue has been derived by means of indirect taxation. Taking customs and excise duties together there has been an increase in revenue from £75,000,000 in 1914 to £127,000,000 for the year ending March 31st, 1917. These indirect taxes are indeed high but it is rightly felt that every class in the community should bear a part of the burden of the war. Moreover, the demand for labor has been greatly intensified. Wages have advanced to such an extent since the outbreak of the war that it is even said that the poorer half of the population, notwithstanding the taxes, is now enjoying greater comfort than ever before. This is a result of war conditions which may well be emphasized in this country, where it has been urged in some quarters that taxes on such articles as sugar and coffee might seriously lower the standard of life of large numbers of the people.

Rates of taxation in this country similar to those now imposed in Great Britain would doubtless yield a much larger sum, since our population is more than twice as numerous. Presumably also the scale of money incomes is somewhat higher. These taxes might, therefore, be expected to yield a sum sufficient to meet a very considerable part of the war expenditures of the government during the next twelve months. It would not, of course, be possible to adopt the English taxes without important modifications. It would hardly be feasible to reduce the exemption to $650. Comparatively high exemption in the United States is probably necessary because of the large number of small farmers, most of whom keep no accounts. The reduction of the exemption to $2,000 would seem to be clearly desirable, and probably to $1,500. Owing to this much higher exemption, in order to secure anything like equivalent results, it would be necessary to impose indirect taxes upon a somewhat larger number of commodities than are subject to such taxes in Great Britain.

The details of a complete scheme of taxation bristle with difficulties. These can, however, be overcome if it is kept clearly in mind that it is both equitable and desirable to meet the costs of war to the very greatest extent possible during the contest. English experience furnishes us with ample evidence that a country at war can endure heavy taxation. It should also silence the objection that heavy income taxes are confiscatory, an objection which betokens a lack of patriotism and which has been strikingly conspicuous by its absence among the heavily taxed people of Great Britain.

Any considerable increase in the rates of income taxation in this country should be accompanied by many changes in the administrative features of the present law. That law is now unsatisfactory both from the point of view of the government and of the taxpayer. In particular, it contains many undesirable deductions which, while satisfactory to those who enjoy them, are inequitable to the mass of taxpayers. Deductions from income are, for example, now allowed for interest on loans secured by securities, the income from which is exempt from taxation. It is most unfortunate that the forthcoming issue of government bonds is to be a tax-exempt security. It gives to purchasers of large wealth with incomes subject to heavy income taxes an undeserved advantage over those with small incomes, an advantage which is not fully offset for the government in a better price for its bonds. A 3½ per cent tax-exempt gov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment bond will yield very nearly as much as a 6 per cent taxable bond to those with incomes in excess of a million dollars if such incomes are subjected to a forty per cent tax. To those with small incomes the exemption is of little or no value. It is a most undemocratic arrangement, which will surely tend toward an undesirable concentration of ownership of the bonds. This unsatisfactory prospect is made even worse by the present right to deduct from taxable income, interest on loans secured by the tax-exempt bonds. Again, the net rental value of a house occupied by its owner is not included as income for taxation purposes and interest on the mortgage of such a house may be deducted from taxable income. House owners have, therefore, a double advantage over those who pay rent, all of whose income is subject to taxation. Defects in the income tax law become more and more serious as the rates are increased. It will in some degree reconcile taxpayers to increased burdens if they feel that the provisions of the law are fair and equitable.

OLIVER M. W. SPRAGUE.

The Logic of Tippoo Na Gai

TIPPOO NA GAI sat in the sun and baked himself. His regiment was to leave that night to go and fight the enemy of the Great White Father. Therefore Tippoo Na Gai sat and dreamed of the lovely Koro Koro, the daughter of Kuniakari. When the war was over Tippoo Na Gai would return with ten gold pieces. He would buy himself two cows and he would buy himself his desired wife. All would be well with the world and Tippoo Na Gai would be happy.

Tippoo Na Gai got up and went to the church, which was situated within the walls of the barracks. He loved the church. It was a beautiful spot. It smelled of strange odors like the forest after the rainfall of early spring. There was a window in the church which looked like a sunset, only it was more beautiful. Inside the church lived Father Jerome. He loved his black children and often told them about Heaven. Tippoo Na Gai and the other soldiers would all go to Heaven only they must not fight and they must not drink evil liquor and they must not steal the wives of the merchants in town and they must love each other. For they were all children of One Father who lived far beyond the mountains of Wayad'uga.

"Father," said Tippoo Na Gai, "I must leave you. I am a soldier and I must now go and fight the enemy."

"My son," Father Jerome answered, "thou must be brave and fight well and kill thine enemy."

"But Father, hast thou not taught me to love mine enemy like my own brother for all these many years?"

"Indeed, so I have and my heart is glad that thou hast learned this lesson."

"Then," asked Tippoo Na Gai, "why must I kill mine enemy and not love him like my brother?"

"My son," Father Jerome said, "thou dost not understand these things as well as thy brother the white man. Thine enemy is an evil man. Thou must kill him and gain Paradise."

Tippoo Na Gai kneeled before the priest. "My Father," he begged, "bless me. I shall be a good soldier. I shall kill mine enemy and I shall come back with much glory."

That night Tippoo Na Gai together with four thousand other men was packed in open cattle-trucks. The next day a fleet of gray vessels took them on board. Four days later the soldiers were landed in a strange and cold harbor. During two months they lived among unfamiliar people. Then they were hastened to the front. And for ten days they lived in a small ditch filled with slime and mud and the smell of decaying flesh.

On the morning of the eleventh day word went round that there was to be a charge. The men were told to rest and sleep. One hour before noon the guns broke loose. The shells shrieked and hissed and it sounded as if the air and the earth were whipped with iron scourges. At five o'clock the guns stopped. The Colonel who knew and loved his men spoke to those who were nearest. He used little endearing words as if he were addressing his own children. "Courage, my little ones. Courage. A few minutes more and we shall be out in the open. There will be glory for all of us. Be brave, my children. Kill the enemy. Now ready . . . one . . . two . . . three," and at the head of his men he rushed towards the enemy. Tippoo Na Gai was the first to follow. A bullet hit the Colonel in the jaw. The blood spurted out of the wound and dripped on Tippoo Na Gai's uplifted left hand. Wild with rage, like a tiger whose mate has been killed, he jumped into the German trench. With a violent thrust he pinned the first soldier he saw against the wooden support of a dugout door. The man shrieked. He was not dead. There was a terrible explosion. Something hit Tippoo Na Gai in the back. He fell to his knees and his hands groped in a world suddenly turned dark. "I have killed mine enemy," he whispered. Then he fainted.

When Tippoo Na Gai came to he was propped up by many white pillows in a small white bed—one of a long row of other white cots. A woman

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came to him. Tippoo Na Gai knew who she was. She was one of God's angels sent to Earth to tend the fallen heroes.

"You must be very still," she said.

"Am I hurt badly?" asked Tippoo Na Gai.

"Quite badly, but you will be well again if you will be very still."

Tippoo Na Gai was very weak. He smiled and the angel from Heaven smiled back at him.

"I am a good soldier and I have killed mine enemy."

"You are a very brave soldier and may God have mercy upon all your enemies."

Two days later Tippoo Na Gai was allowed to sit up for fifteen minutes. Now he could look at the men in the other cots. On his left was a soldier whose face was bandaged. Tippoo Na Gai could not see who he was. On his right lay a figure very white and very still. In some way it looked familiar. The eyes were wide open and at last they met those of the dark soldier by his side.

"Sister," Tippoo Na Gai called, "who is that?"

The Sister came. She put her hand on his shoulder. "You must be very quiet" she told him. "That man will do you no harm. He is one of our enemies and he was very badly wounded."

"Will he die?"

"No he will live, but we must be very careful."

For the second time in his life Tippoo Na Gai had fainted.

For several days Tippoo Na Gai was delirious. Often he wept. He wanted to die. He had not been a good soldier. He had been told to kill his enemy. His enemy was alive. Tippoo Na Gai had not done his duty. Then one night, when the air was full of the tender warmth of summer Tippoo Na Gai saw his chance. The nurse was at work in another corner of the large ward. Silently the wounded man slid out of his bed. One step brought him to the cot of his neighbor. A sudden pressure of two thumbs upon a bare throat, a violent upheaving of a heavy body and the enemy of Tippoo Na Gai fell back dead.

One of the other sick men shrieked. The nurse rushed forward. She found a black soldier with the trusting eyes of a child leaning with one hand upon the chest of his victim.

"I am a good soldier now," he said, his voice full of triumph. "I am a good soldier. I have killed mine enemy."

It took a court-martial just ten minutes to condemn to death the corporal of the second native regiment, named Tippoo Na Gai, who had been born on the mountainside of Wayad'uga. He had been found guilty of "wilful murder." The sentence was to be carried out at once. Tippoo Na Gai asked that he might address his judges. His request was granted.

"Great Master," he said and bowed low to the president of the court, "Great Master, you told me once to be a good soldier and kill mine enemy."

The Court solemnly bowed its head. "So we did."

"Great Master, do you kill me now because I did what I was told to do?"

Even when the bullets hit his breast Tippoo Na Gai still mumbled, "I do not understand the ways of the White Man."

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON.

The Presence of Death

"Chères heures que la mort presse,
ô jeux de l'air, ô bleu du ciel,
ô conscience sans paresse,
ô regard au coeur du soleil!"

HENRI GHÉON.

THOUGH we stand on the cloudy abyss of war, what American can even now believe in death? On the western prairies where the wheat is starting, on Fifth Avenue where the flags are blowing in the sun, it still looks negative, abstract, unreal—a bugaboo of the old and weary. To read almost any collection of recent French books is to get a stabbing realization of death as a positive, concrete, daily presence—the destiny above all of the young and ardent. The stupendous indifference of nature to the human fate and the enormous enhancement of the value of life produced by the chances of war have acted on temperaments like a sort of acid test, rousing the least religious to religious experience: if one accept as religion a concentration in man of his notions of the universal and eternal. The result in the French Catholic, the free-thinker, the fraternal patriot alike has been a precipitation and crystallization of his faith. Middle-aged doctrinaires, like Bourget and Barrès, who never forget that they are also littérateurs, are using this heightened tension in the more or less disingenuous interest of their favorite religious or political theories, and one is glad to turn from their writings to such a sincere and spontaneous young reaction to war as is expressed in the Lettres d'un Soldat.

The author of these letters, who disappeared in the spring of 1915 and is now known to have been killed, was a young painter—very much the old type of hypersensitive, individualistic, solitary, obscure genius whom Rolland represented in Olivier, the French hero of Jean-Christophe; the complete reverse of the militaristic, athletic, healthy minded

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jeune homme d'aujourd'hui who analyzed himself so fully for us before the war. A natural inaptitude for a life of action was in this youth reinforced by a strong belief in his personal destiny as an artist, a horror of killing his neighbor, and a deep aversion to gregariousness of any sort. One guesses that up to August, 1914, his studio door had been tenderly guarded by the mother to whom these letters were written.

The intensity of his pain at being projected "in the full tide of production" from his rich and sheltered spiritual world into the aridity of the trenches is continually plain. Though he was resolved not to consider himself a victim; though he too was sustained by the general collective mood of the young armies—"my only rôle is to carry a right conscience as far as my feet will take it"—he insists continually on the effort of adaptation, on the concentration of energy, the inflexible determination which are necessary to maintain his freedom of spirit. "I isolate myself as much as I can and I am really intact from the intellectual standpoint," he writes at the end of August. Conceiving the war as a sort of cataclysm, he realizes almost at once, with a lucidity which makes the Anglo-Saxon wince, that he must not live either in memory or in hope. His past life is dead; his future is completely uncertain; therefore his only resource is "to draw on the poor sap" of his new estate; to live supremely and intensely in the present, ravishing it from the demands of time and brutal circumstance and transforming it somehow, for himself and his mother, into beauty and force. "Let us not keep the least corner of our hearts for our little hopes; we must absolutely reach the point where no catastrophe can make our life a broken, interrupted and inharmonious thing." And he succeeds. "It is paradoxical as you say, but the most beautiful moments of my spiritual life have just passed. . . . There is one thing that cannot be torn from us—the treasure of soul which we have amassed." "In the midst of all this sadness we live magnificent hours where the things which were most foreign to us take on an august significance."

Whatever one thinks of this war, says Romain Rolland, whatever its results, fighting France will have unconsciously written from the battlefield some of her most sublime pages. "For some of these letters," he adds, "I would give the finest verses of the finest poems." In this particular youth who began every day with fire in his veins, and yet every day made in thought the supreme sacrifice of his life, one finds a purity and freshness of sensibility, and a serenity of soul which are indeed the qualities of great poetry. He welcomes the advance posts because their danger imposes silence on his comrades which he can utilize for meditation. There one sees him brooding under whistling shells like a Chinese philosopher by a waterfall; or, as he suggests, like one of the fighting monks of old who found in the midst of danger hours of supreme illumination. There he can feel, as never before, the beauty of starry night and cold dawn, the intimate significance of his native landscape with its noble contours and changing lights. The letters record a series of delicate and profound visual impressions. Sometimes it is the objective painter who writes as if he were making a pochade—"Love my picture," he says, "it is this which binds me to my destiny"—sometimes it is the mystic whose emotion is all interpenetrated with the beauty of the earth:

> "Exquisite spring weather. What shall I say of this nature whose ample vibrations I have never felt so strongly? . . . I had often known the joy of seeing a spring . . . but never had it been given me to live all its instants. . . . The poet sees the seasons come like great ships whose return he anticipates. Sometimes storms keep them back, but soon they arrive all the same, bringing the perfume of strange lands. A season which comes back seems to bring with it joys of the senses learned in the course of a long voyage."

The mortal precariousness which shadows this book gives luminosity to its reflections of the external world. But its peculiar distinction is rather its inward radiation. One feels there the influence of a non-Catholic tradition—a Catholic education would hardly have produced this strong sense of the individual conscience as the only arbiter with ineluctable destiny. Our soldier is lifted like his fellows by a vague tide of heroic abnegation, which seems to make the fate of France secure. He feels in the youth of his race a magnificent vitality that no outpouring of blood can extinguish. Yet his concern is less with France than with his own adjustment to an impersonal universe, whose general certitudes transcend the petty hopes of man. "If there is an absolute in the register of human sentiments it is suffering. Up to now I have lived in the charming relativity of different emotions amongst which the price, the intrinsic value of life disappeared. Now I feel what life is. It is the instrument which breaks the road of the soul towards the absolute."

Gallophiles will take to heart, for the intellectuals who may be spared, the progressive enlargement, the "amplitude of thought and gesture" which came to this supersensitive creature out of a life of elemental energy in the open. It is an existence "poor in intellectual stimulus, and rich in spontaneous emotion"; and he begins to ask himself whether his Tour d'Ivoire may not be the "cheese of the rat turned hermit." The benefit of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, he cries, will have been to give back youth of heart to those who return from it. His peasant comrades show him not only how to laugh, and how to die—"you do not know the lesson taught by him who falls," he says, "I know it"—but how not to be literary: "My fault as an artist is to wish to dress the soul of my race in a beautiful robe of my own fancy." As the "anonymous" war of 1914, which had permitted him to keep his detachment, develops into the bloody conflicts of the spring of 1915, which make it "a frightful necessity to be a man," he gets a kind of poignant stir of life from violence itself. The *macabre* of the battlefield no longer rends him:

> "The death of the soldier is close to natural things. It is a frank horror which does not palter with the universal violence. I have passed many times by bodies whose progressive decay I could watch, and this new life was more comforting than the cold and immutable aspect of city tombs." After five hideous days of slaughter he comes at night upon the body of one of his friends: "Corpse white and magnificent under the moon: I lay down beside him. Beauty of things which awaked in me. . . ."

The great sacrifice which even this mystic stoic had to admit was to renounce being a "standard-bearer." Yet flags, he said, are for children; it is sufficient for a man to know that the standard will be carried all the same. "Every instant reassures my heart. Nature makes standards of anything, and always there will be eyes to garner the teaching of sky and earth." "Whatever happens," says his last letter, "life will have had beauty."

This sort of sublimation of pain, which to certain pacifists appears sheer unbalance, is the spiritual counterpart of Dr. Carrel's triumph over the horrors of shrapnel and gas. When one sees the most brutal wounds healing as by miracle under the beautiful application of man's intelligence, the wound appears trifling compared to the intelligence: when one comes out of Belgium purged by contact with a nation which has freed its soul by enduring the depths of human suffering, the suffering seems worth the victory. Whether or not such consolations are valid, it is certain that man's gift for making the best of things is the outstanding glory of this war. These letters are now being translated into half a dozen different languages. They are written with that sharp economy of word and phrase which no language but the French can adequately render, but their vibration should carry far. There is a communicative ecstasy about it which makes one feel, as one closes the book, that an instant of supreme vision is indeed the price of life, and that the young heroes of France, and the mothers who live with them in the austere presence of death, are greatly loved of the gods.

ELIZABETH SHEPLEY SERGEANT.

The People as Poets

ABOUT a century and a half ago, the pioneers of the Romantic Movement began to socialize the theme of English verse. To-day, the literary descendants of those pioneers are busy socializing the ability to write verse. In a hundred and fifty years we have advanced from the position that poetry ought to be written for and about the people to the position that poetry ought to be written by the people.

This new opportunity for the people to share in the creation of literature is not without parallel in other forms of art. It appears unmistakably in the expression devices which have of late become so irresistible an allurement to the purchase of phonographs and player-pianos. "Press this ingenious spring," says the manufacturer to the hosts of the wistfully inarticulate, "press this spring, and the innermost hopes and dreams of you will mould the music as it pours forth, and inform it with the beauty that lies rebelliously buried in your soul. Press this spring, and you shall share in the magic of Beethoven and the subtle wizardry of Ysaye."

In neighborhood theatres and in community singing there is a socialization of art only less crude. And for some years now the way has been paved for the people to express themselves in painting. But here the simplification of a traditional technic has repelled the hard-headed socialists of art by its inevitable unintelligibility.

These manifestations of the new spirit in other fields than literature have not alarmed the critics only because they have not perverted those vaguely defined judges of art, the cultured public. No one seriously thinks of the owner of an automatic player as a rival either of Chopin as a composer, or of M. Paderewski as his interpreter. No one, however ardent with democratic enthusiasms, quite overlooks the limited ability of clerks and shop-girls enacting Hamlet. No one has any illusion about community singers as compared with a trained and chosen chorus. By general consent, community singers and player-piano musicians are kept in their proper places.

In the case of free verse there is a salient difference. The cultured public and their highly sensitive servants (or prophets) the editors of magazines, have been shamefully perverted. Socialized poetry has received the sanction of authority; and the critics are frightened and indignant.

As defenders of the sacred traditions these critics are not without justification. They are the advocates of the cause of infinite pains as opposed to indolence, of ability as opposed to wistfulness. And unlike the prosecutors of earlier literary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heresies they are themselves tolerably good poets.

Their outstanding error consists in applying to free verse the canons of a narrow and inexorable technical criticism instead of lavishing upon it the sympathy and insight of a new school of biographical-social criticism—a school of criticism which judges poetry frankly not by its effect upon the readers but by its effect upon the writers.

This is doubtless a new attitude towards literature, but so are the conditions that make it necessary now. For now, for the first time in literary history, the writers of poetry are as important numerically as the readers of poetry.

If the critics have failed to appreciate these altered circumstances, the editors, consciously or unconsciously, have not failed. They are offering to the multitudinous poets of our time the encouragement of recognition. And in doing this they are impelled not by the motives of the literary demagogue but of the far-seeing literary statesman.

It is as if some benevolent baseball magnate, seeing the flabby, bilious hordes that come to his grounds, were to induce them, for the sake of their health, to play baseball themselves, and were to bribe each individual player to exert himself to the utmost by the promise of full bleachers and cheering without end. In the event of such an unusual exhibition of philanthropy on the part of the baseball magnates, there would be an inevitable resentment in the hearts of baseball writers, when among all the myriads of converted bankers and stenographers and clerks and lawyers they failed to discover a single Alexander or Cobb or Speaker or Mathewson.

In their more agile years, many of our sporting writers played baseball themselves, and all of them have given much labor to learning the subtleties and discipline of the game. From them would come an irresistible outcry against this monstrous perversion, against this institutionalizing of a worthless technic, against the men in power for recognizing and sanctioning bad baseball.

On the other hand, from the tribes of the physical culturists and the Better Body Builders and the How to Keep Healthy doctors there would come an eloquent defense of bad baseball. They would point to legions of healthier office boys and ruddier bankers. They would expatiate on increased chest expansion and unfogged eyes and clear complexions. They would applaud the passing of sport as a spectacle, and the coming of sport as an upbuilder of the people's health. In this hypothetical baseball controversy they would represent the school of what I have called biographical-social criticism as opposed to the school of technical criticism.

Now the magnates of periodical literature can do, and are doing, what is so manifestly impossible for the magnates of baseball. They have converted the sitters-in-the-bleachers into players. They have made the readers into writers. They are furnishing the forty thousand yelling fans to these stiff, self-conscious performers.

It would be well if these magnates could have the support of defenders of bad verse. No one has yet written any adequate appreciation of the possibilities of bad verse. The verse, I mean, that is composed at the crises of life, on the mountain tops of exultation and in the joyless valleys, by persons unskilled and ordinarily unpoetic. The verse that is hidden away in vases and bureau drawers, never to be shown, and always produced in some moment of vanity. Only a true poet could write a just appreciation of bad verse; and from his pen the words would come too much tainted with the implication of irony. The quality of bad verse is not strained. It is written to suit no magazine's policy. It is rewarded with no check. It is a brave denying of reality; a prayer that is its own answer. It is, to use Maeterlinck's phrase, "a making or invoking of wings" by creatures that creep on their bellies.

I know that Mr. Max Eastman has insisted on the difference between the expression of intense emotion and the intense expression of emotion; and I know that the kind of bad verse that F. P. A. sometimes reprints is commonly taken as a demonstration of that difference. But these unhappy examples are ridiculous not because they contain intense emotion inadequately expressed, but because they have had all emotion squeezed out of them by the exigencies of an artificial metrical form. Their authors are constrained by rules to be trite, to be banal, to be hypocritical, to be dishonest. Give them a tradition that sanctions self-expression in the more natural rhythms of free verse, and the result will never exhibit the banality and the untruth of the wedding poems and elegies that abound in country newspapers.

Long ago in Japan the tradition of socialized poetry—of bad poetry written by the people—was established through I know not what benevolent agency. And the whole nation is the better for it. "Poetry in Japan," says Lafcadio Hearn, "is as universal as the air. It is felt by everybody. It is read by everybody. It is composed by almost everybody. . . . You might wander, as I have done, into settlements so poor that you could not obtain there even a cup of real tea; but I do not believe that you could discover a settlement in which there is nobody capable of making a poem. . . . The old ethical teaching was something like this: 'Are you very angry?—do not say anything unkind, but compose a poem. Is your best-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beloved dead?—do not yield to useless grief, but calm your mind by making a poem. Are you troubled because you are about to die, leaving so many things unfinished?—be brave and write a poem on death.' "

Something of the same power of poetry over men's lives the vogue of free verse is slowly and haltingly establishing among us. It may be that in a few years the inevitable pendulum will swing, and a rigid classicism will debar from the joys of publication all our upstart poets. But then these million bards will no longer need the tonic of recognition. Among them the great tradition will have become too firmly established for adversity to threaten it. For the sake of the few glad years before their art was made tongue-tied by authority, they will continue to pour the chronicles of their lives into poetry. In an increasingly mechanized age, in a passive age, in an age characterized more than ever by living-by-proxy, this socialized poetry will remain almost the only form of spontaneous emotional expression left to human beings. And for such a gift, the publishing now of five hundred mediocre poems in new and questionable meters, is, after all, a small, small price to pay.

MEYER COHN.

Democratization of Industry

AMERICA has been drifting through an epochal period of world change. The driving necessities of the greatest war in history have revolutionized the governments of Europe. Through terrible lessons new conditions of life and labor have been forced upon all the belligerent nations. Unless our people translate this cruel education into a program of peaceful progress, how are we to maintain our ideals and our commercial power after the war against governments reorganized under martial needs to unprecedented efficiency, against peoples driven by vast debts to a relentless struggle for economic supremacy and welded into a national solidarity of purpose unknown here since the Civil War?

America must be reorganized. But no legislative program will avail to accomplish this purpose until it is based upon a common impulse and desire to establish new conditions. There are no legal pain-killers, tonics, or cure-alls whereby an inspired minority can regenerate a suffering but uninspired majority. It is a weakness of political theorists to regard demands for legislation as an adequate program for constructive achievement. The primary effort should be to create understanding of that spirit in which America must reorganize and to develop a majority purpose to reconstruct our government and our industries so that in enlightened self-interest we may raise the level of the general welfare.

There are in America, as there have been everywhere since governments began, two opposing faiths, one openly admitted—belief in the mass wisdom of democracy; the other openly denied, but the basis of our invisible government—belief in the class wisdom of oligarchy. The well advertised "efficiency" of Germany was the triumph of benevolent autocracy. It was not an hereditary ruler but the united oligarchy of Germany's commercial and political rulers who developed that marvelous coöperative machinery of government and industry. In the forced competition of war the Allied nations have developed like oligarchies and it is hardly conceivable that the end of war will change the character of the governments so reorganized. We have a government in democratic form, and back of that government, and inevitably superior to that government, we have an industrial organization almost as oligarchic as the feudalism of the middle ages. Yet it is a truism that to obtain true democracy in government there must be true democracy in the economic life of the people. All Americans profess to desire the supremacy of democratic institutions. But to contend in the competitions of peace with nations now reorganized by war the industrial rulers of America will inevitably (and partly unconsciously) demand oligarchic expansion of the powers of our government to work in harmony with our oligarchically governed industries. In fact, demands for such extension of powers are already being pressed in order that we may play our part efficiently in the great war.

If those who are of democratic faith meet this drive against democracy only with defense of our political institutions, then, as our governmental power weakens with the incessant struggle for control, our industrial organizations which dominate our government will increase their anti-democratic power. To defend and perpetuate our political democracy we must submit our political faith to the final test, and establish democracy in the commercial government which is the real government of the nation.

Before considering the line of advance toward industrial democracy it may be desirable to demonstrate briefly the character of our present industrial control. Many independent workers may not real-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ize how undemocratic industrial enterprises of large size are, and how completely an oligarchy of interwoven financial, manufacturing, distributing and selling interests dominates our commerce.

The modern corporation provides a means whereby a large amount of capital can be obtained from many investors and used for common profit by a directorate chosen by the stockholders and representing them. To this point a corporate business appears to be a democratic institution. This concentration of capital, however, permits the employment of a great amount of labor; and in the entire lack of any labor representation in the corporate control, the institution becomes wholly undemocratic. For example, $10,000,000 in capital may be invested in an enterprise which employs 5,000 men with a total payroll of $5,000,000 per year. If this $5,000,000 be regarded as a labor dividend at 5 per cent we find in the organization of this business a labor investment of $100,000,000 in contrast to a capital investment of $10,000,000. Yet that enormous labor investment has no representation in the control of the business. On the basis here outlined the Board of Directors represents, and governs the business primarily for the benefit of, 1/11 of the investment, and the other 10/11 is without representation in its government.

As the wage earners have come to realize their impotence under such management, naturally they have organized into unions in order that since their interests are not represented in business control they may at least be represented in effective opposition to such control. Here we find the sound and enduring basis of the warfare between capital and labor, a warfare which must persist until both parties are democratically represented in the control of their joint enterprise. The extreme partisans of each side embitter the struggle with their efforts at a partisan mastery which can only continue the destructive warfare. Those industrial rulers who oppose collective action by the workers and wage a ceaseless war on unionism are as hostile to democratic government as though they sought to reëstablish a feudal kingdom. The weapons of the middle ages have been discarded, but the methods of modern industrial feudalism are as tyrannical as those of the olden times. Economic violence has succeeded physical attack as a means of enforcing the autocratic will, but it is equally indefensible. In depressed times when dividends upon capital investment are likely to be impaired it is a common incident of big business to discharge large groups of workers, thereby depriving their families of any dividends on their labor investment. Yet upon what democratic theory can this preference of capital interest to labor interest be justified? A democratic industry would share the burdens of hard times as well as the benefits of prosperity with all its investors in proportion to their contributions, whether of labor or capital.

A long list of abuses of governmental aid could be presented to show the extension of this feudalistic control of industry over government. The misuse of official power by the courts and by the police and military authorities to support the abuse of private economic power are typical counts of the indictment that might be drawn. But it is unnecessary to multiply examples to prove the undeniable fact of the undemocratic organization of our industries. It is not only manufacturing laborers, but clerks, salesmen, agricultural employees, all those who might be broadly grouped in the salaried and wage-earning classes, who know from quick analysis of their unrepresented labor that we have industrial feudalism persisting in and dominating political democracy.

Where lie the roads to democratization of industry? Let it be repeated that legislation alone will not make the new highways. But tendencies in legislation show us in which direction popular understanding is moving. Social insurance limits the amount of economic violence which industrial rulers can visit upon employees. It also means that the labor interest in industry, backed by a democratic government, is demanding and receiving some recognition of its right to a voice in industrial control. Likewise the encouragement of collective action by the workers, support of the collective demands of the labor investors, is a proper function of democratic government. At present capital investors clamor against unionism because it means strikes. The strike is a powerful weapon of economic violence, crude and cruel but nevertheless a fit weapon in warfare where the employer still uses the battle-ax of wholesale and irresponsible discharge. The strike will remain a necessary weapon of economic violence for labor investors so long as economic violence is employed by capital investors. Not until both labor and capital have their representatives around the directors' table may we expect to see the end of economic violence on either side.

There is a negative part which a democratic government can play in this reorganization of industry which is perhaps more important than positive action.

There has been a widespread and just demand among business men that the government shall coöperate in their efforts to capture foreign trade. In tariff schedules, in ship-building, in diplomatic agreements, are some of the means whereby the government may assist effectively our commercial interests. It is a platitude of politics to assert that the wage-earners will share the benefits of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such national aid. But why should not the government make this profit sharing reasonably certain? Why should not the government say to representatives of capital: You come to us representing an autocratic minority interest in your business, and this is a government by democratic majority. You wish government aid, and in due time after we have aided you we, the representatives of the people, must have our action approved by a democratic majority, convinced that we have acted for their benefit. Is it not therefore more fitting that the demand for aid should come from this majority? Are the labor investors, the democratic majority, represented in the control of this business which you ask the political representatives of that majority to aid? You say you speak for the wage-earners of your industry. Did they authorize you to speak for them or have you merely assumed that right? Is it not time for the political representatives of democracy to establish the principle that the directors of industry who represent an undemocratic control have only a limited right to ask the coöperation of a government whose principle of existence they oppose?

What is here suggested is no sudden revolution in government or industry but only certain principles of action by which we may hope in the coming years to work out the great problem of the rehabilitation of democracy. Political freedom has been achieved upon this continent through two great wars wherein our people staked their lives and fortunes upon that issue. Industrial freedom we possessed in the early days of an undeveloped country sparsely populated. But the day of the self-sufficient individualist is gone. The industrial organization of great masses of men and capital has been accomplished, as the great political organizations of the world were created, by the autocratic assumption of vast power by bold far-sighted men. Thus upon the very ruins of political oligarchies industrial oligarchies have been builded until they dominate by indirect means the governments which they should serve.

America has the established institutions of democracy through which her people can reorganize their industries into harmony with their government. Accompanying this advance the government can be mutualized to aid the general welfare. But to mutualize our government without at the same time democratizing our industries will be but sham statesmanship. To interweave our present industrial and governmental fabric will only weaken both. An industrial oligarchy and a political democracy will not work well together. Inevitably they will work largely in opposition until one or the other shall prevail. If we attempt to carry on this struggle while competing with the reorganized industrial oligarchies of Europe we shall surely degrade our national strength. We shall engage in world competitions enervated by internal disorders. Now is the time to strengthen our fibre while our future commercial rivals are wasting their material and human resources in the battle trenches. Our temporary profits in blood money mean spiritual loss. We may not decently rejoice in their accumulation. But, out of dreadful carnage, spiritual strength is being bred in Europe by the inspiration of which we may well and honestly profit.

This is our day of grace and if we fail now to prepare to meet our obligations we shall find out soon that our day is done. Billions of treasure and millions of lives we are ready to sacrifice to defend our country. Can we not have the vision to spend a fraction of that sacrifice to reorganize our industries and our government into an industrial democracy wherein all the interests of our people may be represented in the control of our political and economic government, and wherein our democratic directors may operate public and private business in the common interest of all the people?

DONALD R. RICHBERG.

At the Capitol

SINCE the adoption of the administration's program of conscription Congress has given its time chiefly to two matters: the espionage bill and the emergency measure appropriating funds for the new army. While the question of censorship has had the attention of the press, behind neither of these bills has there been the more or less unified public interest that facilitated the passage of the earlier war measures. The past week has thus given the first indication of what may be expected of a war Congress that is not coerced by a maximum outside pressure.

The army appropriations bill carried two billion, seven hundred million dollars. It was brought into the House with no special rule to expedite its consideration, discussed for less than four hours, and passed with one dissenting vote. Having previously determined to create an army of half a million men, the appropriation of funds for that purpose was perhaps a perfunctory matter. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that only four members chose to speak on a bill which carried double the sum appropriated last year for the aggregate expenses of the government, and that not more than twenty took part in the discussion with so much as an inquiry. On only two questions, in fact, was there any active display of interest. Quite a controversy arose as to whether Jamestown or Pensacola was more naturally deserving of a $150,000 expenditure for an aviation field. And protracted discussion was given to a $12,000 item providing for "improving and finishing the third floor of the Court of Appeals building." Half of the time that was given to the consideration of the bill was thus spent over matters involving less than a hundredth of one per cent of its total. Moreover, throughout the whole discussion not more than a handful of members were present. "I can only account for the smallness of the attendance," said Representative Borland, toward the close

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the debate, "by the fact that very few members of Congress yet realize the scope of the present legislation."

Very few, indeed, yet realize the scope of the war. They are attempting to meet an international situation out of a background which has served well enough for the ordinary purposes of river and harbor legislation. Their constituents have so long been forcing them to think in terms of districts that they do not readily think in the terms with which they are now dealing. The rapidity of their own face-abouts on a series of recent questions has left them looking about for something that is recognizable. Something which looks sectional—Jamestown and Pensacola—something which is familiarly trivial—the third floor of the Court of Appeals building—they seize upon as a reality. There are certain members who appreciate to what extent the administration is tying them to a policy of internationalism, and who desire effectively to support or oppose that program, without the present ability to do either. For the moment most of the members have not caught up with the consequences of their own activity. Now that the more spectacular war bills are out of the way, they are turning back to the matters which were once their chief concern, and finding that by their own hand these matters no longer exist.

The other measure which has occupied the attention of the House since its adoption of conscription is the espionage bill. Here, apparently, there was a clearer understanding as to purpose. In spite of explicit assurance that the President desired the passage of the censorship provision as drafted, the House struck it out and substituted a restriction less rigorous. But in view of the support which the original provision had in the House that result is not surprising. The burden of the chairman's argument was: "You people stood by the President on the declaration of war, the bond issue bill and the conscription measure, and now that it becomes my committee's turn you are apparently going to funk, and it isn't at all fair." The supporters of the bill were content to coast along on the President's prestige, with no real effort at presenting a case; the opposition, consisting chiefly of members who throughout the month of February had flayed the newspaper cabal that was driving us into war, defended the freedom of the press in a series of set speeches before an almost empty House. How little the debate accomplished is shown in the fact that the final vote was along strictly party lines, with just enough Democrats swinging over to defeat the provision.

Meantime, the Senate has not fully justified the confidence of its members that if the President would only cease usurping its legislative powers it could make quite as effective progress. Since the passage of the army measure the Senate has, with little outside pressure, given its attention to the questions of espionage and embargo. These are broad studies, to be sure, but not broad enough to justify at this time all of the irrelevancies that have been indulged in. Mr. McCumber, for instance, started the members of the Senate off on one tangent by warning them that he had read in a newspaper that the Ancient Order of Hoboes, in convention at Newark, had threatened "not to take up firearms or the tools of production against their fellowmen." Another diversion, and a much more protracted one, consisted in a controversy between three senators as to who had won the battle of King's Mountain, in 1780. Mr. Shields, in the course of an unnecessarily long tribute to the state he represents, had placed credit for the victory in the hands of the Tennesseeans. Mr. Overman objected, declaring that the battle had been won by a North Carolinian, General McDowell. Mr. McKellar, also of Tennessee, denied this fact, and asserted that by the time the battle of King's Mountain was fought General McDowell had been given another command. Mr. Overman reiterated his statement. Mr. McKellar declared that the Senator had only to examine the records of history to find that he was mistaken. Mr. Overman then replied that there were two Generals McDowell, and that Mr. McKellar was thinking of the other one. The argument ran on until Mr. Overman sent for a copy of The Story of the Revolution, and read from it enough to establish his case. Like the discussion that arose over the Ancient Order of Hoboes, this is an extreme case; but both of them are indicative of the time that has been given to incidentals during the past week. Nor has the attendance since the conscription bill was disposed of been more than perfunctory. A vote on one measure of importance to the war was delayed because the debate ended too late in the afternoon; "I doubt very much," said Senator Smoot, "if we can get a quorum at this time of the day."

By permitting nonessentials to consume so much of its time Congress is being prodigal with its opportunities. It has kept the Federal Reserve Board waiting for an emergency measure which passed the last House with one dissenting vote, was killed by the Senate filibuster, and is not yet law. The Shipping Board has been unable to secure the passage of a bill giving it power to seize interned German ships of 600,000 tonnage. It is almost too late for any measure that will help the Department of Agriculture to increase materially the spring sowing. It was, perhaps, an achievement to get through a Congress so badly organized as ours a declaration of war, a seven billion dollar issue and a conscription bill, all within four weeks. But in the time that has since elapsed no reason has been given for believing that without the persisting pressure of a definite public interest, Congress, leaderless and in doubt as to its objectives, can make progress proportionate to its powers.

C. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

Must Economize

SIR: The President made an appeal to all citizens to prevent waste and practice economy. Many of us have felt that we were called upon to make radical curtailment of our living expenses and we have carried out all sorts of economies. The pleasant consciousness of a patriotic duty fulfilled has more than compensated for what we have denied ourselves.

Suddenly there comes a staggering blow to our patriotic impulse to save in the form of a warning from Mr. Howard E. Coffin of the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense against indiscriminate economy. This warning, which has been taken up by the press and re-echoed through the country, has been aimed directly at us, for our economies have certainly been indiscriminate.

It would seem presumptuous for some of us to question the wisdom of issuing warnings against economy, had we not long ago been taught by political economists to regard with suspicion any line of reasoning which seemed to prove that "unproductive consumption" was necessary to give employment to labor. If such arguments are fallacious in times of peace how do they apply to a nation anxious to assume its full share of the burden of this great war? For all the warring nations the greatest problem has been to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure sufficient man power. In all of them women have been called upon to do men's work. And yet Mr. Coffin warns against "unemployment and closed factories brought about by fitful and ill advised campaigns for public and private economy," and one of our most influential banking houses in a recent circular to its clientèle deprecates economies "to the extent of throwing and keeping vast numbers of men out of employment."

Even before war was declared labor was scarce as a result of lessened immigration and the large numbers employed in the manufacture of munitions. Within the next few months enlistments and our own war preparations will take away from their usual productive occupations several million workers. As the production of food and other necessities must be increased so that we may supply these to our Allies, it is obvious that labor should be diverted solely from the production of luxuries. In the absence of government control industrial activity will be along lines which yield the greatest return regardless of national needs, so that we are likely to see the farmers and other producers of national necessities competing—often unsuccessfully—with the producers of luxuries in a struggle to secure sufficient workers.

Habits of extravagant living are so firmly fixed in the American people that no propaganda for economy is likely to produce any very radical changes, while any suggestion that these economies are a possible source of danger will have a most deterrent effect. Are not these warnings against economy stifling a patriotic impulse that is essential for national efficiency in the war?

FRANCIS P. DENNY.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Different Kinds of Objectors

SIR: Should Congress not define what is to be the government's policy in dealing with conscientious objectors? Theoretically, they will fall into four groups: (1) conscientious objectors against any participation in any war; (2) conscientious objectors against any participation in this war; (3) conscientious objectors against military participation in any war, and (4) conscientious objectors against military participation in this war. But inasmuch as man's individual moral life must solve its problems in the world of concrete reality, most conscientious objectors will be primarily conscientious objectors against this particular war, though some will coördinate their convictions with their leanings to principles of abstract pacifism. And inasmuch as most thinking Americans recognize that in the intricacies of the economic and social process there will be no one who will not perforce in some degree (even if only in sharing the burdens of retrenchment and taxes) be participating in the prosecution of this war, most conscientious objectors will be primarily objectors against military participation. Practically, then, the government will have to deal mainly with the fourth class: conscientious objectors against military participation in this war.

These citizens are not, by any means, all sprung from the stock of the peoples with whom we are at war. Many are as English in stock as Bertrand Russell and those thousands of conscientious objectors in England. But of whatever stock, they should know what fate the government has in mind for them. May they offer, and be permitted to substitute, for military service some service of a non-military character by a joint compromise: a compromise on the part of a government which respects even in wartime the rights of conscience, and a compromise on the part of a group of sorely beset citizens, whose love of America cannot be justly impugned, however misguided it may seem. If not, what is to be their punishment? Are they to be given jail sentences—for the period of the war, or for such number of years as the civil courts in the different districts may determine? Or are they to be dealt with by the military authorities? Are they to be interned as prisoners of war? Are they to be shot as traitors? It seems to me a clear and an early settlement of the entire question is of the highest importance.

CITIZEN JAMES.

New York City.

Criticism of the Courts

SIR: In the issue of The New Republic for April 14th there appears an editorial comment that forces me, reluctantly, to come to the conclusion that the finest journal in the United States has stooped to engage in the popular pastime of criticizing the courts unduly. I have never before seen an article in The New Republic involving criticism of any character but that it was constructive: in the past whenever a criticism has been offered, The New Republic at least had some suggestion—such as it was—for improvement.

> "Nothing could bring more strikingly to light the constant peril of leaving to the courts their present power of reviewing legislation under the fifth and fourteenth amendments."

If the courts are not to review legislation under the 14th amendment, or, for that matter, under the entire Constitution, to whom should this function be delegated? Is every act passed by the congress constitutional; is every bit of state legislation given that consideration before passage that will enable it to stand through the ages? If the answer is no, then it necessarily follows that the Congress and the state legislatures are incompetent to pass upon the constitutionality of statutes. Taking the power away from the courts, would you delegate it to the President, and the governors of the various states? Or possibly to a bureaucracy—the passing fancy of the times?

In California we have recently witnessed the unpleasant sight of our august legislative body deliberating about three weeks over the proposition whether or not impounded dogs should be sold to university medical departments and other medical institutions for vivisection. The issue is not vivisection, but merely whether or not such institutions shall receive cheap dogs. The legislature has wasted more money and time in its deliberation over this bill than the cost of all the dogs all the institutions will need in ten years would be. Assuming your proposition to be sound, the California legislature is given the power to set aside the Constitution whenever it sees fit, and the only alternative is to move to the South Sea Islands where a Colt's "45" furnishes the only security for continued existence.

The duty of the people of the United States is to place men in the courts who are qualified—not political shyster lawyers, i. e., by appointment—and not to remove them except for malfeasance or dereliction. If this is done we have the best security possible for proper interpretation of the law under the anomalous system of government of confederated states.

WALTER C. FOX, JR.

San Francisco, California.

[NOTE: Of course we mean that this kind of legislation should not be reviewed at all. Whether the minimum

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wage takes a man's property without due process is a question of social policy, not of technical law. Why should not the legislature decide it? As long as the decision is left to the courts, their most important function will be a political one, and Mr. Fox's ideal of an independent, non-political appointive judiciary cannot be and should not be realized.—THE EDITORS.]

Defense of Free Speech

[NOTE: We gladly publish the following announcement of the American Legal Defense League.—THE EDITORS.]

The American Legal Defense League is composed of public spirited citizens including both militarists and anti-militarists, who think it imperative that our American liberties of free speech, free press and the right peaceably to assemble be legally defended against any encroachment wherever made by any public official. It is necessary in the first instance to defend and later to appeal to the higher courts in any part of the United States all cases where it is deemed that these fundamentals of liberty have been invaded. Governor Whitman is a member of the board of advisers.

Already halls have been refused for public discussion, meetings have been broken up, speakers have been arrested, censorship has been exercised not to prevent the transmission of information to enemy countries, but to prevent the free discussion by American citizens of our own problems and policies.

Lawyers in any part of the United States who wish to enlist for the legal defense of free speech and free press are urged to send their names to Harry Weinberger, General Counsel for the American Legal Defense League, 261 Broadway, New York City.

Service for Pacifists

SIR: Not lessened by the adoption of universal service as a definite national policy, there appears some popular disposition to look askance upon men of strong pacifist sentiments who conscientiously cannot perform the duties of a soldier. Let me submit that in a democratic country this is one of the very fundamental things to avoid in a time of national crisis.

The true pacifist is not an obstructionist, pure and simple. Indeed, being something of an insurgent, he is, if anything, more likely to know the "whys" of his course than those who follow more closely the beaten track. Particularly for him, these searching days have compelled the marking out of his philosophy more concretely and practically than ever before, and in so doing he has managed to keep abreast of the times.

Quite as much as of anything else, it is unfair to judge pacifism by its worst or most radical exponents. It is the part of pettiness and irrationality, and at the same time no answer, simply to impugn the motives and scoff at the sincerity of those who differ. Those who are clamoring, at the first call, to be enrolled in the army and navy are not, by any necessity, those who in the end will prove the backbone of the democracy. At a time like this, when civilization needs its every resource, men are needed who think and who can apply, wholeheartedly, to that branch of endeavor for which they are most fitted their best appreciation of the truth with large honesty of purpose.

With this principle the latest departure of policy of the American government is in complete accord. Universal service is of the essence of the creed of pacifism. The true pacifist is not a man who seeks to avoid his responsibilities. He simply demands an opportunity to fulfil his obligations in ways conformable to his best instincts. Even in the short time since April 6th, this attitude has been conspicuously demonstrated by some of the most prominent pacifists in public affairs. With most commendable equanimity the authorities at Washington have shown every disposition to hamper in no official way freedom of choice as to lines of active service. The only unyielding requirement is that somehow, somewhere, everyone shall "do his bit." This is good pacifism; and among true pacifists it has meant the germination of new and vital forces of which the nation can little afford to take anything but the fullest advantage. We have seen that services to be rendered in civil pursuits are quite as essential to the common welfare as to fill the ranks of the fighting forces. To darken the doorways to service other than that of a military nature is to render a positive dis-service to the country in time of need. May we not more fairly recognize the real sincerity and public-mindedness of pacifists of this class, who, I believe, do after all represent the considerable number, and so insure to these men and women honorable position as working assets in the larger public service? To accomplish this is to make secure the first essential step in applying the principle of universal service.

CECIL ELWYN WHITNEY.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The News of Mooney

SIR: As The New Republic acutely points out in its issue of May 5th, it is "a commentary upon the attitude of the American press toward labor" that we should have to get our labor news from San Francisco via Petrograd. It would also seem as though The New Republic should shoulder a share of the blame for this apparent conspiracy of silence. Its fundamental obligation toward industrial justice and decency in this country should have forced it to expression in a situation where so much more than a man's life was at stake. To be sure the new evidence in Mooney's behalf appeared only a few weeks ago, and the pressure of international events may well have made comment upon it difficult at the time; but from the start of the trial in the summer of 1916 the whole labor world has struggled to secure for Mooney the publicity and fair-minded interest necessary to show up the motives and methods behind his prosecution. For lack of such publicity he was condemned to death along with unionism in San Francisco.

With quite innocent generosity The New Republic assumes that "The Times, like all other eastern papers, had apparently heard nothing of the new evidence that had caused a sensation in San Francisco almost two weeks earlier." Granting that the Associated Press may easily have ignored the Mooney trial, and California correspondents of metropolitan papers may have deemed it unfit for the sensitive souls of eastern readers, the news appeared in noisy headlines in the New York Call the day after it broke, and has since rivalled the war as a space-filler in that paper. Readers of the Call did not have to wait for their news from the far West to filter through the Russian censors. And the Call, I must add, appears among the daily files of our most respectable newspapers.

FREDA KIRCHWEY.

Princeton, New Jersey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Censorship and Mooney

SIR: The suppression by the eastern press of the Mooney exposé brings up a rather important consideration. A modern newspaper is generally understood to bear a moral obligation to the public to give a reasonably accurate record of *all* the day's important happenings. Few newspapers live up to this obligation; excepting Socialist or labor papers, almost all newspapers discriminate consistently against such news as that of the Oxman letters, no matter how important, dramatic, or charged with human interest it may be. Witness the distorted reporting of and the ruthlessly unjust editorial comment on the Bayonne strike by the principal New York papers last year.

Just now the leading newspapers of the country are fighting strenuously for the right to print all the war news (except what may be of direct benefit to the enemy) and to criticize freely. The newspapers are saying, in effect, that for the sake of the country the government's military projects and policies must face the same high-class brand of reporting and editorializing which in the past has been devoted to all other matters. Their whole case, in other words, rests upon the well understood assumption that their reporting is to be accurate and their criticism honest.

Doesn't this Mooney affair, and others of its kind, throw a peculiarly damaging light on the newspapers' plea?

ETHELBERT WALDRON.

New York City.

Austria-Hungary Must Disappear

SIR: "To put it bluntly, America will not carry on the war a single day to dismember Austria-Hungary. . . ."

Thus again, this time in your issue of April 28th, you declare your belief in the right to exist of a state which has been held and is being held together by chains, as someone has recently declared.

It may be that in calling these matters to your attention I am entirely too persistent, but permit me to tell you again that your statement may be paraphrased about as follows: America will not fight for a united Poland; America will not fight for a united Serbia; America will not fight for a united Rumania; America will not fight for a united Italy. And this leaves out of consideration the situation of the Slovaks under the Magyar rule, and the condition of the Bohemians under the rule of Vienna as dictated by Berlin.

Now it may be a debatable question whether America should fight for the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, but it is not a debatable question that without the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary the freedom of small nations cannot be realized, and consequently that the several declarations of the President will remain nothing but grandiloquent phrases if this country passively or actively is to uphold the right of Austria-Hungary to exist.

If war is the continuation of politics, the strategy of war must be brought in accord with the political objectives sought to be accomplished. The military blunders of the Allies in southeast Europe were due to their failure to realize the importance of the Balkan and the Austrian problem. Their view of these problems of late has been rectified. It will be well for America not only to learn by avoiding the Allied military mistakes, but also to learn from them the necessity of clear political thinking in international matters. A condition of such clear political thinking is a realization that Austria-Hungary is not a nation; that it is not even a state, since it has become a vassal of Germany; that at most it is a government, and a mighty poor one at that. Clear political thinking is a necessity not only on the part of the government, but journalists as well.

CHARLES PERGLER.

Cresco, Iowa.

[NOTE: We would call Mr. Pergler's attention to the fact that there is a vast difference between complete political independence and autonomy for nationalities. With the single exception of Poland, we believe it will be unnecessary actually to detach much territory from Austria-Hungary in order to carry out the President's war aims. —THE EDITORS.]

An Independent Africa

SIR: Rivalry in the ownership of semi-civilized lands has been a fruitful cause of war and of bad feeling for ages. Part of the reason why the Prussian government tried to hack its way through France was to seize such lands as belonged to other nations.

If a league to enforce peace had been in existence during the last 200 years, it would probably have been the duty of such a league to administer these semi-civilized lands instead of allowing them to be managed by any one nation. Such a league would probably have administered such territories in much the same way in which the league of the United States of America administered the territories of this continent. While such a league of nations will be established in the future, it certainly is not in existence now, and has not been in the past. But if we wish to avoid still more disputes, we must act so far as possible as if the principles of such a league were being enforced.

A continent that has caused a great deal of hard feeling is Africa. I suggest, therefore, that a step towards international peace and good will would be taken if all the nations that hold portions of Africa, should cede such territories to the Union of South Africa, and if Great Britain allowed the Union of South Africa to become an entirely independent nation to be known perhaps as the Union of Africa.

All European nations could then enjoy the same privileges of trade and settlement that they now enjoy with other countries. They would be under no expense in maintaining colonial armies. The Allies might properly guarantee the independence and stability of the proposed Union of Africa.

W. MAXWELL REED.

Framingham, Massachusetts.

Officers from the Trenches

SIR: There are thousands (some say 35,000) of Americans now fighting in the British armies in France. Hundreds of them must be non-commissioned officers, and some doubtless have commissions. In this country there is a dearth of officers for the armies we are about to raise, and none of our officers have had experience of just the kind of fighting that is going on in France. The two facts belong together. We urgently need the services of a large group of these officers to assist in training and leading our army. Immediate arrangements should be made with the British authorities to allow such men to return for this purpose.

ALBERT R. CHANDLER.

Columbus, Ohio.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

IF ever I set up for a regretter of old times, for an exalter of the past, I shall not forget the change that has overtaken our decency debates. One need not go deep into the past for an example of the debate that is no more. The middle nineties will do. It was about that time that Le Demi-Monde, translated I think by Miss Marguerite Merington, was played in many American cities. Hers was a good version, easy, speakable, pointed. It afforded only one strange flower of adaptation. "You talk like the late M. de La Rochefoucauld" was turned into "You talk like Dr. Johnson or Carlyle." A bolder and more thorough adapter would have written: "You talk like Dr. Benjamin Franklin or Artemus Ward." However, it was not upon details like these that our eyes were fixed in those days, but upon the eternal decencies. Wherever Dumas's play was given there appeared overnight a crop of finished men of the world, men who knew life well, who knew good and evil, and who declared, with final finality, that Le Demi-Monde was all right for them and their like, but that it must not be seen by refined women, or by the young. They looked both virtuous and knowing if you asked them, thinking yourself rather clever, whether this wasn't just the play to help an adolescent leave innocence behind and approach their own blessed sophistication? They did not think such a question worth answering.

Of late years, as soon as a decency debate gets started, we all notice at once that the centre of interest has moved since the eighteen-nineties. Then nearly everybody assumed that innocent ignorance was a fine thing for youth. Even the defenders of a play called indecent mostly confined themselves to asserting that it would teach youth nothing, or not much. Now the typical "indecent" play is nearly always a serious attack upon silence. It is defended on the ground that it calls attention to the evils of silence about sex, and breaks this silence. Less and less is it attacked by persons who maintain that silence is a good thing. "Even if we admit that greater knowledge is desirable for youth, the stage is not the place from which this knowledge should be disseminated. Even if we admit that the stage, etc. . . . this particular play is not, etc. . . ." Contemporary attacks upon "indecent" plays follow this fashion. The defence, too, has a new fashion of its own, to which all the defenders more or less conform. They are a mixed lot, these defenders. Some of them know at first hand what harm is wrought by silence about sex. Others are uneasy and apprehensive for the future unless they are doing something to lessen the number of unmentionable things and unspeakable words. Nearly all the defenders have a weakness in common. They suffer from a tendency to call every serious play that has been attacked on the score of indecency a work of art, and to think that no genuine work of art can be in any of its details indecent. By following this fashion they deny the rich possibilities of art, they degrade it into a servant of decency.

Frank Wedekind's Frühlings Erwachen is the latest occasion for a renewal of the decency debate. Justice Erlanger, of the New York Supreme Court, refused the other day to enjoin Mr. Bell, the Commissioner of Licenses, from carrying out his threat to revoke the license of a New York theatre in which an English version of the play had been or was about to be given. I have not seen this or any other English version. I have not seen the play on the German stage. But unchanged, as Wedekind wrote it—my copy was published in Munich, 1908, by Albert Langen—Frühlings Erwachen would be impossible on any stage in any part of the civilized world. It contains one scene which would make half of any conceivable audience sick, and another scene which would finish off those whose stomachs had been strong enough to bear the first. No amount of art could have made this second scene possible. It is disgusting to read. It would be more disgusting to see. . . . And yet, after all, perhaps Wedekind knew what he was about? Perhaps he did not put this scene in merely because he likes filth? I have just reread the play, and after I had put it down, and had given it time to go on living its own life in my mind, I realized how much this scene counted, and why it was there. Without it, or without something like it, we should not feel so strongly in most of the play—what Wedekind was bent on making us feel—the essential innocence of children's curiosity about sex. "You say this curiosity is unnatural and prurient and wicked, do you?" asks Wedekind. "Here goes, then—I'll show you some really debauched youngsters, and let you see the difference. All the worse for you and your children if you can't see!" So he put in this scene.

Does this mean that I think Wedekind one of the pure in heart, a man who always has moral purpose in his ink pot, whose every scene is a means to a moral end? No, not quite. Morals interest him. His plays are rich in moral reflection. "Und nun," says the Marquis von Keith to his young friend, "nun übermittle ich Ihnen den Stein der Weisen: das glänzendste Geschäft in dieser Welt ist die Moral." Der vermummte Herr, in the last scene of Frühlings Erwachen, gives a slightly different definition: "Unter Moral verstehe ich das reelle Produkt zweier imaginärer Grössen. Die imaginären Grössen sind Sollen und Wollen. Das Produkt heisst Moral und lässt sich in seiner Realität nicht leugnen." When Wedekind put these words into the mouth of Herr Gabor he must have been looking forward with amusement to what would be said of Frühlings Erwachen: "Wer das schreiben kann, was Melchior schreibt, der muss im innersten Kern seines Wesens angefault sein." Just as he printed, on the title page of So ist das Leben, this quotation from one of his critics: "In der deutschen Literatur von heute gibt es nichts, was so gemein ist, wie die Kunst Frank Wedekinds."

Whether Wedekind himself thinks his art vulgar and low, I have no idea. But I am sure that he doesn't much care. His art is the representation of real and very much alive persons, of real states of mind, by fantastically humorous means. And he has never mastered the art of the stage as he has mastered the art of verse, of the contemporary ballad. In all his plays that I have read there are blank, tedious places. The craftsman is less interesting than the man, than the wise and dirty humorist, impassive when he is dirty, when he is wise, when he is both, when he is neither. Unless you can believe in a man who likes dirt, humor, wisdom, each for its own sake, you cannot believe that Wedekind exists. To believe in his existence is not easy on any terms. It is almost against nature that any one so coldly and crazily fantastic should be so wise. But it is not against nature that any one so wise should be so dirty.

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beethoven

Beethoven, by Romain Rolland. Translated by B. Constance Hull. With a Brief Analysis of the Sonatas, Symphonies and Quartets, by A. Eaglefield Hull. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $1.50.

M. ROLLAND'S essay comes to remind us afresh how burdened a thing the existence of Beethoven was. His life was indeed a "long and pitiful martyrdom." The brief interludes of wellbeing, the hours spent in the fields about Vienna, the ephemeral happiness of the love affairs, the very exaltation of work, scarcely relieved the long monotony of despondency and grief. The fact that Beethoven, despite his terrible freight, did succeed in creating music, remains incontrovertible testimony to the stoutness and the grandeur of his spirit.

From childhood, Beethoven was unhappy. His father, a drunken and illiterate tenor, commenced very early to exploit the boy's talent. At eleven, Beethoven was helping support the family by playing violin in a theatre orchestra. A couple of years later, he added to this work the labors of organist in the chapel of the Prince-Elector of Bonn. At seventeen, he was practically the head of the family, and responsible for the upbringing of his two junior brothers. He was oppressed not only by material cares. All during his adolescence, he suffered from the despondency that was to remain with him all his life. Years after, in 1816, he wrote, "He is a poor man who does not know how to die. I knew, when I was only fifteen." There were other obsessions. He was morbidly conscious of his ugliness. His mother having died of tuberculosis, he had a hypochondriac fear that he was likewise affected, just as in later years he was haunted by the fear of sudden death, because a grandfather, whom he thought he resembled, had died of apoplexy.

Deafness came on him when he was only twenty-six, a short while after he had migrated to Vienna. For a brief period he managed to conceal his affliction by avoiding all society. But soon, concealment became impossible. He could no longer hear the higher notes of instruments and voices. Conversation became increasingly difficult. He could not hear the normal modulations, and at the same time found it unbearable when folks shouted at him. He felt himself cut off from all intercourse, eternally alone. To his friend Wegeler he wrote, "How often I curse my existence!—If it be possible at all, I will courageously bear with my fate. But there are moments in my life when I feel myself the most miserable of all God's creatures. Resignation! What a sorry refuge! And yet, it is the only one left me." And in the Heiligenstadt Testament, he added the cry, "O Providence, let me have just one pure day of joy! I have been a stranger to the thrill of joy so long!"

His relations with women were unhappy, too. Wegeler says that he never knew Beethoven free of a love passion carried to extremes. And yet there is no evidence that Beethoven ever really loved successfully. The Gegenliebe that he sang so often, that he celebrated in Fidelio, remained to the end an unrealized dream. Uncompromisingly puritan, Beethoven conceived love only under the guise of marriage. And he never consummated such a union. Giulietta Guicciardi, no doubt, returned his interest. Unfortunately, her conception of their relationship was not Beethoven's. For her, marriage with him was out of the question. Beethoven, after all, in spite of his exalted patrons, was only a poor musician, while Giulietta was an aristocrat. But after she had made a convenient match with Count Gallenberg, she was quite prepared to resume the relation. She made various attempts to recapture Beethoven, and even came to see him in his lodgings. He sent her away.

Later, he became affianced to Theresa, sister of his friend Frank von Brunsvik. The engagement was broken. By whom, we can only conjecture. Theresa married, and afterwards interested herself completely in the orientalist Migazzi. It is possible that Beethoven voluntarily renounced her. For perhaps there was something in his spiritual composition that demanded that the Immortal Beloved be the Far Beloved as well. Was he not one of those men who can say with Stefan George—

> "Ihr rufe junger jahre die befahlen
> Nach IHR zu suchen unter diesen zweigen:
> Ich muss vor euch die stirn verneinend neigen.
> Denn meine liebe schläft im land der strahlen?"

At any rate, he was never able to give himself to any one woman for long, neither to Theresa von Brunsvik, nor to Theresa Malfatti, neither to the absurd and pretentious Bettina Brentano, nor to the actress Amelia Sebald, though he came very near marrying the last. They met in 1812 at Bad Töplitz. It was for her that he rhymed the macaronic,

> "Ludwig van Beethoven,
> De qui, sans nulle peine,
> Vous seriez la reine."

He was taken ill, and Amelia nursed him back to health. Then they separated. Five years later, Beethoven told a friend "She was the woman of my dreams. And yet, I couldn't make up my mind to go any further with her."

He made a last attempt to find an object for his love. It was perhaps the most unhappy of all his unhappy relationships. Much has been written about Beethoven and his nephew. It has been the fashion to hold Carl van Beethoven perverse and cruel. The legend that Beethoven found him rifling his writing-table has gained general credence. Though M. Rolland does not countenance the story, he still insists upon Carl's scoundrelism. We find ourselves, in this matter, preferring the version of the relationship suggested by M. Vincent d'Indy's more temperate, if less lyrical, essay on Beethoven. There, we find Carl adjudged less vicious than weak. At worst, he was a frivolous guardsman, attached to gaming and to "das süsse Mädel," the damsel that, Schnitzler tells us, "is loved in the city and married in the suburb." Carl's frivolity exasperated his uncle. Beethoven, who had originally torn the lad away from his mother, proceeded to mother him himself. Curiously enough, instead of improving Carl, the attentions exerted a evil influence on his character. Carl resented his uncle's importunate ministrations. He rebelled, and took pleasure in disobeying. Once he said, "I have become worse because my uncle is trying to force me to become better." Beethoven, blind with affection, continued his strict surveillance, worked himself into frenzies of rage when Carl spent the night dancing in the Prater, alternately passionately reproached and passionately forgave him till Carl, in despair, tried to commit suicide. He did not die. But Beethoven collapsed. It was the unhappiness of that last of his relationships that sent him, more than his financial distress, or other cares, to his grave.

As we peruse M. Rolland's brief history, and realize once more that Beethoven was all his life long a Florestan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to whom no Leonore came in prison, to whom no envoy save Death brought release, we cannot avoid a single painful suspicion. Strive as we will against it and its sinister implications, we cannot dismiss it as quite unfounded. It suggests again and again that this incessant accumulation of misery in the life of one man could not have been entirely fortuitous. It makes us speculate whether, after all, Beethoven was not one of those unfortunates who, quite unconsciously, seek out passive suffering as their one mode of existence. The thought is not preposterous. The world has known not a few such Hamlets who, rather than aggress upon life, hug misery to them with sick fervor. To us, Beethoven's career, with its continuous suffering, is explicable in no other fashion. It is even possible that his deafness itself was but a physiological symptom of the desire that held him so ironly from wellbeing. It, too, might have been a manifestation of that tragic flaw that made of his existence a distraught hesitation, and left him, all his career, the prey of feverish dreams.

If that suspicion is well founded, if Beethoven was indeed all his life his own prisoner, self-incarcerated in his hunger-tower, then his was a tragedy indeed. For those who hold him, in the phrases of Sidney Lanier, "dear living lord of tone," "sole Hymner of the whole of life," his figure will, of course, seem no more tragical than before. For them, his wretchedness, whatever its occasion, was but an obstacle placed in his path by a benevolent Deity desirous of making him triumph the more by making him triumph over difficulties. It was but a friendly black, making the white radiance of perfect achievement into a veritable dazzlement. We, in our day, can scarcely hold it such. We cannot, for instance, subscribe to the complacent statement of Edward Carpenter, "Everything conspired in Beethoven to make his utterance authentic, strong, unqualified. His solitary habits left his mind clear of the mud which the market-place mistakes for thought; his deafness, coming on at so early an age, increased the effect, and left him fancy-free in the world of music." To us, no such consoling thoughts come. For we have of late felt a certain dissatisfaction with much of the music of Beethoven. For us, he is no longer the "dear lord of tone." Despite its many magnificences, his music no longer exercises over us the absolute hold it had over other generations. We feel there a certain want. And, strangely, that want appears the direct result of the deprivations, the inhibitions, the limitations of contact that embittered the life of Beethoven. It is therefore the thought that they might have been self-imposed becomes so inordinately painful.

Whatever we, who feel this want so keenly, feel about the music of Beethoven does not, of course, blind us to its multitudinous excellencies. The revelation that we have made is far indeed removed from the complete depreciation attempted of late by certain European critics. For us, his art will ever remain a monument to the might and the sublimity of human spirit. Its pervading adolescent bloom, its freshness,

> "Tasting of Flora and the country green,"

its bold rythmic sweep, the reflection of revolutionary times that we find in it, the loftiness and purity of spirit in which it was conceived, will remain forever marvellous. Who can help reverencing the high nobility of intention in Beethoven's work? He turned to his art out of a great pity for human suffering, a magnanimous desire to console and invigorate and redeem his brothers. He who had himself suffered so cruelly, who had craved joy and brotherhood and love in vain, dreamt of a music that should heal all the wounds of life, and bind mankind in one great fraternity. Magnificent tentative! Small wonder generations have adored Beethoven, and wished to believe that his aspiration had become reality.

It is the very fact that so little of it did become reality, that so much of Beethoven's music remains intention, that has forced us to question the absolute preëminence of Beethoven the artist. So many of his works are artistically incomplete, one feels again and again that the struggle between the man and his medium remained undecided. That struggle was not the one that must have underlain the work of Bach—the struggle to disengage the proper form of the material. It was rather the resistance of a material against the superposition of a form intellectually conceived. We have the sense again and again that, in this piece or that piece, Beethoven attempted to force some literary, some philosophical idea upon the music, that he tried to make it establish some abstract conception. Was music always the primary and important matter for Beethoven? We can scarcely think so. Rather we are assured that it was morality, ethics, philosophy, that often music was interesting to him only as a means of expressing their truths. To us, the C minor Symphony obeys, not so much an inherent musical, as an extraneous intellectual logic. Does it not represent, after all, "The Triumph of the Honest Man Over Fate"? Wasn't Beethoven attempting to moralize in tones? For us, the Finale of the Symphony with Chorus is not truly joyous. It is so only by intention. The music belies the words, and seems hollow. Beethoven may have wished to represent joy. But we feel in that movement only the wish to represent it. One could add many examples of similar and similarly ruinous procedures. For they are present not rarely in Beethoven's work, and, for us, are a most serious detraction from its permanent value.

And that artistic flaw that made him so irreverent of his medium was unquestionably the result of his harried and inhibited emotional life. We find a like trait in all artists who were victimized by their environment. Nay, we find it in many persons not creatively gifted. Because of the difficulty of finding emotional expression, they react with dread from all unconscious and spontaneous modes of expression to such as are consciously controlled. They force an intellectual control on to their emotional activities. So it was with Beethoven. Fearful of all unconscious artistic creation because he was afraid of his own unruly, turbulent unconscious desires, he intellectualized his art. He went so far as to try to force certain abstract formulas on it in the place of natural form. He tortured his stuff till often it lost every trace of spontaneity and charm. It is that striving after a "form" which is not really form that mars so many of his piano sonatas, his later quartets. It fills his work with passages of rhetoric. We can be grateful that it was not always efficient. There were times when the intellectual control relaxed. And so we have the divine Pastoral Symphony, the piano sonata of the variations, the Kreutzer sonata, some of the earlier quartets, and all of Beethoven's work that remains immortally fresh, immortally lovely, immortally young.

Immortally young! Is not that the precise beauty of what is beautiful in the work of Beethoven? Is not his music one of the supreme, the complete expressions of human adolescence? To us, it seems so. It seems adolescent in its glory of animal spirits, adolescent in its yearning and its feverishness, that feverishness that turned the calm and Olympian Goethe from it. It is adolescent in its very sense of impo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tence and pain. It is adolescent in its young strength and ardour, half peasant-like and half divine. We do not feel in Beethoven's music what we feel in Bach's—the fully plumbed depths of human experience. We do not feel there the gigantic mature power of Händel. We do not feel behind it the complete personality that we feel behind the music of a Haydn, a Mozart, a Brahms. But we do feel there one of the supreme expressions of youth, feel it there so richly, so fully, that we know ourselves in the presence of one of the permanent art-forms of all time.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

For the General

Heredity and Environment in the Development of Men, by Edwin Grant Conklin. Princeton: Princeton University Press. $2.00.

THE qualifying phrase in the title of this book makes it rather a misnomer. Professor Conklin does have something to say about Mendelian inheritance in man and closes with a peroration on eugenics and ethics, but by far the greater portion of his space is devoted to an exposition of what an educated layman should know concerning the fundamental facts of cell development and inheritance. For this attempt we may be truly grateful. On the whole, biologists have not been so niggardly in the dispensation of these results to the outsider as the votaries of other branches of learning. Indeed, the complaint is rather of an embarrassment, if not of riches, at least of varying and incommensurate currency. Between the biometricians who see red at Mendel's name and the Mendelians biting their thumbs at the biometricians; between Darwinians of the old guard who assure us that even Huxley never quite understood the principle of selection and the adherents of mutation who deny to the struggle for existence anything beyond a destructive power; between experimentalists of the Jacques Loeb pattern who resolve all life into physico-chemical processes and experimentalists like Driesch who are equally positive that life is something that eludes a mechanical analysis, the intelligent general reader is hard put to it to decide what doctrine to accept amidst such a pandemonium of disagreeing doctors.

In this perplexity Professor Conklin, so far as the scope of his undertaking permits, proves a trustworthy guide. He is nothing if not safe and sane. Whether he discusses the claims of the chromosomes to being the sole carriers of heredity, or the influence of environment, or recent experiments on selection, one gets a uniform impression of fair balancing of contradictory evidence, even where the author's own preferences are clearly marked. Here and there, it is true, we cannot suppress the suspicion that this quality is not so much the outcome of a really thoroughgoing analysis but rather of a congenital love for compromise, a desire to temporize with his Majesty's opposition, to call it fifty-fifty and honors even. "And I am right, and you are right, and all is right as right can be!" However, this is certainly preferable in a popular work to one-sided insistence on one's favorite hypotheses.

The pedagogical task involved in the attempt to produce a generally readable book on heredity has, on the whole, been creditably solved. There is a really admirable section on sex-determination, the Mendelian principles are clearly put and illustrated with appropriate examples, while the evidence against the inheritance of acquired characters is marshaled briefly but with telling effect. Only the chapter on Cellular Basis of Heredity and Development suffers from an excess of detail, the author's evident object being to omit nothing of real moment. He seems to have had a somewhat different audience in mind here—the biological college student rather than the general reader.

The last hundred pages, though of greatest general interest, are hardly an organic outgrowth of the preceding chapters. Here the author turns lay preacher and expounds his views on eugenics, incidentally grazing birth control, coëducation, determinism, the conflicting claims of the individual and society, and what not. He says much that is wise, much that is sound but platitudinous, and also much that is merely platitudinous. The curious thing about it all is the strange discrepancy between the section on Eugenics and the immediately following chapter on Genetics and Ethics. Here a unified social philosophy was not only desirable, but would have been perfectly feasible from Professor Conklin's own point of view and for a man of his judicial temperament. But instead of wandering, as we might expect, the golden middle path, he tries to guide us all but simultaneously along the high road of eugenics and along the low road of critical judgment. The result is that we lose our bearings.

It is not that Professor Conklin, when he eugenicizes, is at all radical in his specific proposals. As soon as practical measures are broached, that rarest of gifts, commonsense, preserves him from absurdity. He realizes that every race probably has good qualities that might fit it into the general scheme of human society. He deprecates "the wholesale sterilization of all sorts of criminals, alcoholics and undesirables without determining whether their defects are due to heredity or to conditions of development."

TIFFANY & CO.

CHINA AND GLASSWARE
LATEST IMPORTATIONS

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He has little expectation of a race of supermen and wisely refrains from positive advice on the choice of mates. But, for all that, between pages 407 and 456 he undoubtedly in principle rides the eugenical hobby. Though some races with good capacities have been exterminated, we are told that dominant races *will* dominate and are in general the most capable. Though the concrete suggestion to sterilize the inmates of all public institutions shocks Professor Conklin's sense of humanity, he appears to wax wroth at the abstract thought that millions of defectives are permitted to perpetuate their kind.

What are we to think, however, when beginning with page 457 the author launches forth into an almost diametrically opposite train of thought? While on page 454 we have been assured that heredity is more potent than environment, we suddenly learn less than twenty pages farther on that the power of environment may outweigh inheritance, that "a relatively poor inheritance with excellent environmental conditions often produces better results than a good inheritance, with poor conditions." While on one side of the eugenical Mason and Dixon line we are duly humbled with a quotation from Galton purporting to prove that the native endowment of the ancient Athenian was indefinitely greater on the average than our own, we discover on the far side that after all heredity has been kind to most of us; that we possess unused stores of energy, as William James taught; that there is a host of "mute, inglorious" geniuses in our midst who cannot rise solely through lack of proper environment.

It is assuredly highly creditable to Professor Conklin's humane sentiments and also to his instinctive powers of judgment that he is at bottom so relatively little tainted with current biological dogmatism. Nevertheless the current prejudices are there and the total effect of his sociological doctrine is that of an unresolved discord. It is really a pity, for he has thus missed a splendid opportunity for giving a clear-cut and consistent expression to what he has expressed here and there, haltingly, and with little regard for logical rigor. The biologist needs a reminder of his limitations nowadays, and it would have come with the best grace possible from one of his immediate colleagues.

In the first place, the biologist must learn the lesson taught by Huxley that an impassable gulf divides what is from what ought to be. The moralist and social reformer is under no obligations whatsoever to put himself into harmony with the cosmic process, he will rather attempt to combat and conquer it. We can accept the struggle for existence as a dynamic principle in nature and yet supplant it with the principle of coöperation in society. We can bow to the doctrine that acquired characters are not inherited, that nature is far more potent than nurture, and yet abate not one jot from our contention that environment shall be improved to the utmost and that our ideals of humanity shall prevail in the treatment of even the least favored. The social reformer stands to the biologist in the same relation as the architect to the physicist. The architect cannot disobey the facts of gravitation but his plans, while thus circumscribed, are not positively prescribed by the laws of falling bodies. So the social builder will not attempt the impossible by neglecting the fact of individual differences, but that fact has a merely limiting value for him, affecting his means but never his ends.

But there is another subject on which the eugenicist fanatic requires instruction. We cannot assume gratuitously that every trait to which we attach a positive or negative value is inheritable. Some of us would sooner condone murder than a breach of table manners, yet the latter assuredly are not a unit character. As Professor Boas has once more pointed out in the November issue of The Scientific Monthly observed differences are often not the result of an organic basis but the product of social environment. No matter how much more significant heredity on the whole may be than environment, it remains to be proved that any particular trait that may have social bearing is inheritable, and so long as the biologist fails to submit his demonstration, the sociologist will simply laugh him out of court.

ROBERT H. LOWIE.

An Apology for Romance

Greenmantle, by John Buchan. New York: G. H. Doran & Co. $1.35.

SINCE the realists began to devote themselves to the study of nervous physiology, it is in other directions than their effort that the average reader has been compelled to turn for amusement. Mr. D. H. Lawrence has become nothing so much as a highly qualified instructor in the abnormalities of sex. Mr. Gilbert Cannan apotheosises the mean and nasty environments of the North of England. Mr. Wells—though Mr. Britling shows a welcome sign of return to a happier and better manner—seemed for long to devote himself to the colossal task of a full-length portrait of Mr. Wells. Mr. Bennett brought the trained mind of a brilliant microscopist to the analysis of every-day life. With all of them, in fact, the novel has become a social document; and its object has become less to furnish relief for the tired and irritable man of affairs than to offer food for sociological reflection on the one hand, or material for the future philosophic historian on the other.

Romance has been thrown aside. No one now reads Scott or Dumas or that admirable Jane Porter whose Scottish Chiefs was, not so many years ago, the inevitable refuge of the schoolboy whose mother objected to piratical adventures in the drawing-room. Or, if they are read they have become "improving literature"; and the cumbersome notes and prefaces with which a bastard criticism provides them serves to whittle away the edge of their glamour. For we live in an historical age. Every schoolboy is trained to read Quentin Durward so that he can later explain its place in the life-work of Von Ranke. Not even a fashionable schoolgirl is deceived by George Eliot's Savonarola. We are convinced and permanent sceptics. We cling to fiction only because it is an admirable introduction to the work of the social psychologists. Even our poets have ceased to write poetry and find the new inspiration in the elaborate versification of economic truisms. One cannot help suspecting that Mr. Wilfrid Wilson Gibson had in view rather the great body of economic students at Harvard and Columbia and the West than the diminishing body of people who still believe in Keats and Byron and Shelley. Mr. Edgar Lee Masters, of course, is the high priest of sociological verse. Even Miss Lowell is apologetic when she writes of petals and teacups and grass. Mr. Sandburg writes easily of the fishmongers of Chicago. What place in so practical a time for the story of high and desperate adventure?

A reader who has courage and a room with lock and key can make bold to purchase Mr. Buchan's book and glory in it. It is a tale of secret service in the great war and it is not unworthy of its theme. It is full of people who do im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible things in a fine devil-may-care manner that suggests they really did do them. Its villains are very bad people who frown monstrously. It has a lovable stage American. The Kaiser flits across its pages in an admirable moment of fine portraiture. Its heroes are stalwart, clean-limbed soldiers with a happy knack of extricating themselves at the very moment when your heart is fit to burst.

Of course you may turn up your nose at such a book. It is not pragmatic. It neglects the realities of war. Fighting has ceased to be romantic and became a matter of exact mechanical calculation. The important thing is no longer the strong right arm, but food supplies, fuses, oil, big guns, wooden ships with standardized parts. The individual is dead and the only thing of interest is the analysis of mass-formation. Of course there is truth in this; and doubtless the Zola of the war will write its realistic epic in twenty documented volumes. But there seems no adequate reason in the world why an age of machines should compel us to limit our interest to its machinery. One admits that the historian will get no profit out of Mr. Buchan's volume. But if you like to sit in an arm-chair at night and find yourself suddenly transported to the gates of Constantinople and watch the companions of the Rosy Hours dance their dance of eerie death and then find their leader suddenly transformed into the fellow you left in London with secret instructions to find out who Madame Von Einem was and why the Germans cherished her—you will take the quickest road to the nearest book-shop. For two hours of unadulterated pleasure one at least of Mr. Buchan's readers can stand as sponsor. There is no instruction in the book. There are no references to Freud or Mr. Sidney Webb or the social influence of Tuskegee. You will not have to read it with one hand on the index to the Encyclopedia Britannica. You will just be thrilled—as Cooper thrilled you with his Mohicans and Dumas with his Musketeers. You will arise refreshed from the contemplation of great exploits greatly performed. And next day's business will seem the brighter because for one short evening you have held commune with the impossible.

I know all the sins of which the romancers have been guilty. They paint a rosy picture of things that never happened. They tell the modern fairy-tale with the additional sin of pretending that the thing is true. But there is a sweetness about their immorality which somehow is absent from the noble virtue of their rivals. With a proud consciousness of wrong, I range myself with the vicious.

H. J. L.

Contributors

to this issue

O. M. W. SPRAGUE is professor of economics at Harvard University and the author of History of Crises Under the National Banking System and of Banking Reform in the United States.

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON was Associated Press correspondent in Belgium during the first year of the war, and is now professor of Modern History in Cornell University. He is the author of The Fall of the Dutch Republic, The Rise of the Dutch Republic and The Golden Book of Dutch Navigators.

ELIZABETH SHEPLEY SERGEANT is a graduate of Bryn Mawr College, has lived in France, and is the author of French Perspectives.

MEYER COHN was graduated from the College of the City of New York in 1914, and from the Columbia School of Journalism in 1915.

DONALD R. RICHBERG is a lawyer practising in Chicago who has been associated with all liberal political movements in that city.

CHARLES LAMB to a YOUNG AUTHOR

My dear young Scrivener:

You have asked my advice in regard to submitting your manuscript to the Yale University Press and as I had no knowledge of that house other than that gained from an enjoyment of its books, I have made your request the excuse for a visit to it.

Mindful of your work, I inquired first of all who passed upon the manuscripts submitted to them, and here I discovered one of the great advantages of a University Press. For to determine what shall be published and what rejected, their manuscripts are submitted to a University Committee, which is able to call to its assistance the trained opinion of the entire University body. (I can see that Committee in my mind's eye—a wise group. Imagine them smiling with pleasure as they vote upon so scholarly a work as Porter's "Lombard Architecture."[1])

I made inquiry also regarding their selling department. My experience in royalties has been just enough to make me mindful of its function. I found their book "Civilization and Climate"[2] in its Second Printing, "The Fundamental Basis of Nutrition"[3] (a timely book in these days of high food costs, of which I purchased a copy) in its Fourth, and "The Diplomatic Background of the War"[4] in its Fourth Printing—a certain proof that their sales methods are effective. Indeed, I saw them preparing royalty checks which I should not have been humbled to receive.

The attractive dress of the books of this house was, if I recall rightly, what originally drew you to them, so that I need not be led on to describe their appearance. My taste was especially tickled by "The Growth of Medicine,"[5] full of lore of the Middle Ages and enticingly illustrated.

In short, I was most pleasantly impressed by the Yale University Press and would have you send your manuscript to them, i. e., providing that it is a good manuscript; for unless it be a work of merit, it will be returned to you with a courteous note.

Should you wish to see a catalogue that you may better imagine how they would announce your book, make inquiry for it. They will be delighted to send it to you. Indeed, your bookseller, if he is a man of discretion, will have their books. Consult him regarding them and have him show you a volume after my own liking, "Journeys to Bagdad."[6]

Call on me if I can serve you further and believe me

Yours very sincerely,
Charles Lamb.

[1] LOMBARD ARCHITECTURE. By Arthur Kingsley Porter. *4 vols. $50.00 net per set.*
[2] CIVILIZATION AND CLIMATE. By Ellsworth Huntington. (*Second Printing.*) *$2.50 net.*
[3] THE FUNDAMENTAL BASIS OF NUTRITION. By Graham Lusk. (*Fourth Printing.*) *50 cents net.*
[4] THE DIPLOMATIC BACKGROUND OF THE WAR, 1870–1914. By Charles Seymour. (*Fourth Printing.*) *$2.00 net.*
[5] THE GROWTH OF MEDICINE, from the Earliest Times to about 1800. By Albert H. Buck. (*Second Printing.*) *28 illustrations. $5.00 net.*
[6] JOURNEYS TO BAGDAD. By Charles S. Brooks. (*Third Printing.*) *27 woodcuts. $1.50 net.*

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

120 College Street, NEW HAVEN, CONN. — 280 Madison Avenue, NEW YORK CITY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BETTER MEALS *for* LESS MONEY

By a former Instructor in a famous cooking school and a practical housewife.

A cook book full of suggestions for the intelligent buying, cooking, and serving of meals which will give the most possible nourishment and pleasure with the least possible expenditure of money, time and energy.

The general suggestions for economy take into consideration the entire life of the family, and are made with the idea of economy in the long run. They do not, therefore, require an inordinate amount of time, an expensively equipped kitchen, or a total elimination of one's favorite cuts and relishes.

The tables for food value and time needed for cooking are accurate. The quantity to allow for each person is also indicated.

2nd printing, $1.25 net

HENRY HOLT & Co., 19 W. 44TH ST., NEW YORK

To Cut the High Cost of Living

THE GARDENETTE
OR CITY BACK YARD GARDENING

BY BENJAMIN F. ALBAUGH

32 Full Page Illustrations, Net $1.25

STEWART & KIDD COMPANY, Publishers, Cincinnati

CYPRESS possesses so remarkable an *investment value*—for so great a variety of uses, indoors and out, from fine library doors to pasture fences—that it is well described as "the world's most *valuable* wood," *though by no means an expensive one.*

"CYPRESS lasts practically forever." It does not warp or shrink or swell like most woods—it *takes paint perfectly*—and it *defies decay* if used *without even a filler.*

Well is it said—"*cut out your repair bills*—build of CYPRESS *at first,*" and that "*he who builds of* CYPRESS *builds but once.*" *YOU TRY IT.*

All-round Helps Department

Southern Cypress Mfrs.' Ass'n
1255 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, La.
1255 Heard Nat'l Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

UNION PACIFIC
Standard Road of the West

The Scudder School 816 W. 72nd Street, at Riverside Drive, overlooking the Hudson

For girls and mature young women. Day and boarding. *Myron T. Scudder, Pres.* A modern school actively meeting problems of today. Preparatory. Dramatics, Home Economics, Secretarial, etc. Red Cross and other preparedness features included. Gymnasium, games, swimming teams

Address REGISTRAR, N. R. Scudder.

RIVERDALE COUNTRY SCHOOL—RIVERDALE-ON-HUDSON
NEW YORK. FRANK S. HACKETT, A.B., Headmaster
An Elementary and Preparatory School for Boarding and Day Boys. Scholarly, intimate teaching; expert physical training; an atmosphere of care for the best influences.

SILVER LAKE CAMP in the Adirondacks

Healthful, happy camp life for girls. Horseback riding, swimming, all sports and handicrafts taught by experts. **Sleeping one story above ground. Self government.** References required. For further information and booklet, address

The Director of Silver Lake Camp

62 Montague Street, Apt. 26 Brooklyn, N. Y., Tel. 4025 Main *or* The Packer Collegiate Institute Brooklyn, N. Y.

"You boys at Greylock are lucky boys—lucky that you have parents that are big-visioned, who appreciate that growing boys like you need ten weeks of glorious, full breezed out-door life," said a visitor addressing the campers at

CAMP GREYLOCK

on Centre Lake, in Heart of the Berkshires. Prospectus on request.
GABRIEL R. MASON, Ph.D.
Principal, Public Schools, N. Y. City. 1107 Forest Ave., New York.

The Training School for Community Workers
—of—
The People's Institute of New York
JOHN COLLIER, *Director*

A one year course of training for professional work in Community Centers, Social Settlements, Public Employment and Child Welfare Services.

Registration Day—October 8th
For Catalogue and Information write to
JOHN W. MCCABE, *Registrar*, 70-5th Ave., New York

The New or Modern School to be established in connection with Teachers' College will be known as

THE LINCOLN SCHOOL OF TEACHERS' COLLEGE

It will be located at 646 Park Avenue, between 66th and 67th Streets Both Boys and Girls will be admitted.

A pamphlet explaining the scope and purpose of the school will be sent on application to

OTIS W. CALDWELL
Director, The Lincoln School, Teachers' College, New York City

To Any New Republic readers. If you will buy a copy of Francis R. Bellamy's new novel, "The Balance," at our bookstore in the Pennsylvania Station, or the Lord & Taylor Book Shop, and you don't agree with us that it is a *fine* novel, we will exchange it for any two novels you pick out. This is not a "trick of the trade," but an attempt to get attention to a worthy book.

Published by

DOUBLEDAY, PAGE & CO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED